



THE STUDENT WORLD

A quarterly magazine of the World's Student Christian Federation

ROBERT C. MACKIE, *Editor*

Temporary addresses of the Editor, 347 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y., U.S.A., and 151 Bloor Street W., Toronto 5, Ontario, Canada.

Volume XXXVI

First Quarter, 1943

Number 1

EDITORIAL

The Crisis in the University

The crisis in the university must be regarded in two ways. It is plain to any observer that it has come upon the university from without. The story is by now a tragically familiar one for readers of THE STUDENT WORLD. Crude nationalism has crushed universities, until out of them has trickled a thin stream of scholars, which was their life-blood. Ruthless imperialism has nailed up their doors and driven professors and students from their precincts. Relentless invasion has swept away whole institutions, so that only fragments can be pieced together a thousand miles away. Demands of the armed forces have emptied classrooms, and again filled them with the cadets of war on land, on sea and in the air. Never has the university been more profoundly affected by external events.

Not all is loss. Speaking on the third anniversary of the shameful deeds which accompanied the closing of the University of Prague the Czechoslovak minister to Canada said to the University of Toronto: "These students suffered and died that other students might learn the cost of freedom." Through the very contrasts of our day, we are learning the value of objective study, of free discussion, and of disinterested service. It may be that those who some day return to the quadrangles will know why they have come back, more truly than their predecessors of 1919 knew.

v. 36
1943

Not all is loss. The dispersion of scholars has led in times past to the rebirth of culture. A glance at the map today shows how, by some strange trick of destiny, the universities of China and of Russia have been thrown back into the centre of that great land-mass which we call Asia. There, amidst incredibly adverse circumstances, universities are being rebuilt on simple, heroic lines, and are of sheer necessity sharing their life with the common people.

In a more profound sense, however, the crisis has come upon the university from within. The signs of its coming were clearly apparent between the two wars. Four years ago an issue of THE STUDENT WORLD contained a group of articles, which were "at one in denying that the modern university is a university in any real sense of the word". Today outward events have helped us to see the inner situation more clearly. The university has lost its identity. It has not had a life of its own as distinct from the life of the world, the world of national interests and commercial competition. In peace it was designed to meet professional and business requirements, so in war what is asked of it is "officer material". The tragedy of the university is that it has not known its allegiance; and it has therefore been at the beck and call of any insistent voice. No wonder that the students, even in countries with political freedom, wonder whether their alma mater can really nourish them after all.

Once again not all is loss. There is evidence of heart-searching amongst university men and women. There is less pride on the part of professors, less arrogance on the part of students. Where all is confusion it is necessary to keep together until the way forward be found. After the conventional outer defences have been broken down, there has been a rally to defend the citadel itself. Stories have come from occupied Europe of stands made on some half-forgotten principle, which have thrilled the whole world. Not all is loss. A Chinese professor remarked after the destruction of the outward form of his university by shells and explosives and fire: "We used to think the university had to do with buildings, but we have none; we used to think that it had to do with books, but we have few left; we have discovered that a university is where some men are prepared to teach and others prepared to learn." The rediscovery of the meaning of the university will have to go deeper than that, but it has begun to be made.

It must be made, for the situation is terribly urgent. We are already talking too easily in some countries about rebuilding university life. While gallant relief workers in China and Europe are saving what they can of this student generation for the future, we are beginning to plan in terms of world student relief. It is a noble enterprise, our duty and our privilege, but we are uncertain of the basic ground-plan of our rebuilding. It has been a revealing experience to tour the universities of the United States on behalf of the universities of China in their struggle for bare existence, and the improvised universities in the prison camps of Europe, while these highly equipped American institutions were one by one handing themselves over to the guidance of the military mind, because they did not have a clear idea of their own specific contribution to the struggle of the hour. We must become clear about the meaning and function of the university, or we shall find ourselves patching up an effete system, or, worse still, handing ourselves over to new forces of destruction.

This issue of THE STUDENT WORLD is a modest contribution to this essential task of university men and women. It is not the thinking of the World's Student Christian Federation which is so outstanding in this matter, though there are searching and challenging statements in the articles which follow. The important fact is that the Federation believes the clue to this search is to be found in the Christian faith. Only a universal faith is of any service to a university, and the other absolutes have betrayed us. Can we learn what it means to rebuild the university in relation to the Christian revelation of God?

It is vital to note that we are not here talking about applying Christianity, like a coat of paint, to the cracking surface of the university. In one South American university a figure of the Christ stands with arms outstretched above the entrance. It is a fine conception for university architecture, but the impression is modified when you learn that it is a recent attachment to an uninspiring structure. There is another South American university, which stands unscathed in a ruined city, because it was built upon earthquake-proof foundations. Without any reflection upon either of these particular institutions we may say that the second is the more fitting symbol of the true university. A decorative addition, even in the form of a new chapel, will not prevent a university from leading men to destruction. But, if a university is erected upon the proposition that this is God's world, it will not only not

imperil those who work in it, and live around it, but it will also provide them with a firm footing in the search for truth.

In this matter there is a danger into which the Christian forces in the university may readily fall; it is that they may talk big and do little. Our student Christian movements belong to the old conception of the university, they are more or less useful adjuncts to a system which tolerates them. They have their exclusiveness, and their divisions, their peculiar jargon and their petty pride; seldom do they seem to bear a profound relation to the life of the university as a whole. In the days ahead this situation will be altered, but perhaps not in the direction we should prefer. Either the Christian forces will be swept aside as wholly irrelevant to the new pagan purpose of the university, or they will become centres of that fresh life and aspiration which alone can save culture for the spirit of man. It is a tremendous task, and we must lay our plans accordingly.

R. C. M.

The University and the Spirit of Man

JEAN BOSCH

What is the mission of the University? That is the question which we have to face. But at the same time this question raises others. Is it understood as a matter of course that the University has a mission? And are we clear what we are talking about when we talk of the University? It seems to me therefore that before approaching this subject we ought to come to some agreement about the terms employed.

What is the University?

First of all, what are we to understand by the term University? Even in current usage the word has several meanings. The University is a building, or a group of buildings, very much broken up into departments, which is intended to receive teachers who teach and students who are taught. But the term also covers a vast institution whose ramifications, supported by an important administration, extend over the entire area of the nation, and, in an entirely anonymous fashion, are responsible for public instruction. Finally it may refer to the official body of professors and teachers, sometimes indeed the collective entity found in the buildings of which we spoke.

Let us make it plain at the start that when we talk of the University we do not understand that term in any of the senses we have just indicated. In its origin the University was something wholly different. In the Middle Ages the name of *Studia Generalia* was given to the school or institution which gave instruction. The Universities were strictly speaking corporations formed by teachers and students in the defence of their own interests and to safeguard the liberties necessary for the exercise of their functions. That is to say that the essential characteristic of a University was that it should be a community. It was doubtless the *primordial* importance of this community and the rôle which it subsequently played which resulted in the prevalence of the term *University* to express the institution in its entirety. It may be that this community aspect has almost entirely disappeared from the University of today, which has become merely an

assemblage of individuals who, while doubtless united by similar preoccupations, do not form a corporation with one aim, and with interests, mission and welfare in common. But the fact remains that it is the teachers and students who make the active and vital element in the University and that there cannot be a University in any real sense of the word except in so far as teachers and students form a community. To form a community, there must be something in common. It cannot depend merely on inheritance from the past, for the past in itself is dead; it cannot mean only *interest*, for interest is a mere external link between different individuals: a syndicate is not a community. To create a community, a deeper bond is required—for example: a common task, a common mission, a common function.

The Mission of the University

If we say that the University has a mission, we mean that the living community of teachers and students has a mission or a function. This mission is undertaken and carried out in common. It is even the mission which creates the community. Everyone finds himself responsible for his own share. The teachers are there with another aim than just to give instruction or to hand out diplomas; the students have something to do besides attending courses or passing examinations: all are united by the definite task which they have to accomplish together. The special rôle of teacher or student merely indicates the place in which each one has to be a member of the University community.

But we must not forget that in speaking of the mission or the service of the University, we are not on the ground of objective speculation. It is rather the question of what we have to do and to be as teachers or as students. It is a matter of the responsibility which we share with others.

The Spirit of Man

Let us therefore examine this mission of the University, or rather the particular aspect of this mission which we might define as *Service of the Spirit of Man*. What in the first place is the spirit of man?

We must admit that the term "spirit" is frequently wrapped up in a general vagueness. To many people it represents a region which is extremely lofty, but wholly immaterial, and altogether

far removed from anything one may call practical and concrete life. We are certainly not referring to this vague and distant god when we speak however provisionally of the service of the *human* spirit. We would here consider under this term man's capacity to know and to think with all the consequences of these functions for his life and for that of the world.

The Bible can help us to understand this potentiality of man in speaking of his *responsibility*. The Bible tells us that man was created responsible, that is to say, capable of *response*; that distinguishes him from the other creatures. God created him thus in order to have facing Him a being to know and love Him as only His creation could know and love Him, to be a living link between Him and the world, to be capable of intercourse with Him. To *respond* means, in the Bible, to *be* wholly in what one *says*. In the Bible speech is an act—the highest act of all. To *respond* will then mean for man to *respond* on behalf of himself, and since he has been set as chief and lord over the works of the Eternal, to *respond* also on behalf of creation, in its place and for its sake. This *responsibility* presumes a knowledge of the beings for whom one *responds*; that is of oneself and of creatures, also an authority and a power exercised over them. When man speaks in the presence of his God, his understanding and his power, his thought and action are wholly present in his speech: he is a unity, body and soul, spirit and matter, thought and action. He has no thought which is not measured by his purpose; no action which is not closely dependent on his thought.

Man's failure and struggle

So at least was it at the first creation. But then there came the Fall, man refused his response to his Creator, and everything lost its true direction, everything broke up and was divided. Man no longer stands before God, bringing to Him in his response, in his words, one whole, his personality and that of the world in which he lives. Man has turned aside: he no longer feels responsible before his Lord either for himself or for the Creation. He has lost the unity of his thought, his authority and his power. The Creation, animate and inanimate, no longer obeys one who is himself disobedient. He no longer understands himself, nor does he understand what surrounds him. He lives in a state of divorce between body and soul, of thought and action, of spirit and matter.

Yet he goes on living: his Creator has left him that possibility, having still something to offer him. Man lives and struggles against death. He tries to understand himself and the world in which he is placed. He tries to regain power over animate and inanimate creation. He struggles to find a unity between his body and his soul. He fights in pain and suffering with a world which has become hostile, in order to live and not be crushed by it. He strives continually to understand and to think in order to win power and mastery. This effort of man is to be man, this labour to which he is destined and condemned, is found expressed in a culture and leaves its mark on civilisations: science and the arts and institutions are all a manifestation of it.

Further, the will to live must be there, and the desire to find a unity, and to affirm his existence: indeed man must have the will to fight and to conquer. For the force of division is always there and death is installed in the world. A moment always comes when man, if he has not been stopped earlier, ceases to struggle, sinks and dies. The same is true of nations, cultures and civilisations; the moment comes for them also when they cease to think of living, turn rather to the past and lose inclination to struggle, die slowly or suddenly. Division takes hold on them. One of the surest signs of this agony is the disappearance of creative work, of culture.

The disappearance of culture

It is at this point that our age has to face a searching question. Think of modern culture, which in most cases has become a superfluous luxury without an essential relation to the existence of mankind. The industrialist and the business man, after leaving their daily task, their subjection to the economic order and technology, even their family and social life, find an ineffectual haven in their novels, their books of history, their picture galleries, or their religion; yet they have no true culture, however high a point of refinement they may seem to have reached. Their life is divided, thought from action, spirit from matter, body from soul. And what shall we say of the proletariat who only have a share in culture through the unexacting distractions of the newspaper, the radio or the cinema?

Let us think chiefly of the University, where science is subject to the scientists. The scientists in most cases do not seek to know in order to live. They are hypnotised by facts and bound

hand and foot to scientific skill. They analyse matter, but the spirit is not there. This is what Kierkegaard emphasised with regard to a particular domain, that of the natural sciences. "If I cast a glance on this domain," he wrote (and he included here all who seek to understand and to decipher the rules of nature, from the scientist who calculates the speed of the stars and seems to arrest their course in order to scrutinise them more closely, to him who describes the physiology of such and such an animal; from the scientist who looks down on the surface of the earth from the high mountains, to him who descends into the abyss; from him who pursues the formation of the human body through its countless shades, to him who observes the worms in the intestines), "I can see naturally here as elsewhere (but here in particular) examples of men who have made a name in science by an immense patience in collecting. They know a great quantity of details and have found many others, but that is all. What have they to offer but a substratum to the reflection and the work of others? And yet we see our people contented with all these accumulated minor facts. They remind me of the rich farmer in the Gospel: they have laid up stores for themselves, yet science can say to them: 'Tomorrow I shall demand your life.'" (Journal.)

Nature and Science, the University and the scientist and scholar are standing side by side, outside life—their own personal life as well as the life of the world. When intellectuals are not talking of knowledge for the sake of knowledge, or culture for culture's sake, they are aiming at utilitarianism, the immediate practical and industrial utilisation of their knowledge. Between these two possibilities, they are not aware of a human choice. They are in an ivory tower, they are spirit far removed from matter, thought removed from action, soul without body. And during this time, men and nations live and die within matter and action, within a body that lacks a soul: the world is turning to the beast. "Man is neither angel nor beast: he who would achieve the angel, only achieves the beast."

The service of the spirit of man

We may now understand a little better the nature of the service of the spirit of man. It is the effort to help the spirit to become human, that is, to share in man's work and in his struggle to survive. Naturally it is concerned with man's thought as

applied to every object : with his knowledge of himself and of the world, of culture and science, of art, morality and philosophy. But all these things may point to death and not to the service of the human spirit if they are not understood from the human angle, if they are not the expression of man's striving towards his own unity, if his spirit is not aided to form and master matter, if thought is not incarnated in action.

Let nobody think that this has anything to do with the subjection of the spirit of man. If the human spirit is to be itself it must remain free, that is to say it must not be the human slave of any outward power. This subjection assuredly represents a danger which men can often not avoid, but which reappears continually under different forms. The human spirit can make itself independent of material interests. It can become the slave of the powers of this world, whether political, economic or ideological ; it can be chained by a *prioris* of every kind. History and our present world are literally swarming with examples of such slavery of the spirit. It is clear that the subjection of the spirit is the negation of the spirit. For scientific research, art and culture are only living realities in so far as the spirit of which they are the fruits maintains its authority over the concerns which it weighs and directs.

But this spirit is only with equal truth human spirit in so far as it is truly reality, creatures and created and living things, that it weighs, directs and inspires. There is no *human* spirit except it be enjoyed in the reality of life, that is to say incarnate. There is no culture except when man, directed by his spirit, *works*, that is to say is moulded by the land to which he belongs, and moulds it in his turn. This does not mean that action should be made the goal of life, but that the human spirit should be so deeply engaged in human life that action comes to birth from its labour. The human spirit has only meaning in so far as it gives a life, a nation, a civilisation their spiritual roots, just as a life, a nation, a civilisation cannot live unless they grow from spiritual roots.

The function of the university

The primary function of the University is the service of the spirit of man, which is to say it must be the place in which one is assured that man's life, his being and activities, are conceived, scrutinised and known, that the world can be discovered, known and directed to a certain end. The University to be sure has no

monopoly of this task. Science is to be found in other places, and culture is not the exclusive appanage of intellectuals only, but is a *human* concern.

But here, in the University, we are to demand and to safeguard this liberty of spirit which is necessary for its authority and which is so often compromised. And we can see to it that the spirit of man should continue to be at work in the world and accomplish his work of direction and inspiration. And that is why the proper function of the University is scientific research and culture. *This* is its work, and like all human work, it has the right to be done in the highest seriousness and with the strictest honesty.

Finally we must remember that it is the University community which is in the service of the spirit of man. That is, not the impersonal entity or the institution which we call University, but the body of teachers and students—for from the moment when this service of the spirit of man is taken seriously, it is no longer the individual destiny or career which counts for each one, but the common function which is corporately assumed, one for another and one with another. A fine career, a good degree, a settled job—all of these are objects which blot themselves out behind the common will to serve the spirit of man. Each individual must, without doubt, develop and assert himself, and devote all his resources, but this is done within the framework of the common function. It is the unity of this function, it is this service which controls the community and makes of it a living body. This is the University we must hope for. We must not wait until educational reform achieves it: administrative decisions cannot bring it to birth. It is we who must desire it, and desiring it means to put ourselves, each one of us in his turn, and one with another, in the service of the spirit of man; and that means for each one of us the discovery, in his own life, and in the University community of the sense of a living culture and of a real knowledge.

The spirit of man, slave or free?

But a last question faces us. It is not enough to desire a University which will be a community in the service of the spirit of man and of the spirit engaged in struggle. We must also know in what direction the spirit is struggling, to what anchor it holds, what spiritual values it will assert, what basis it will give

for action. Here once more the Scriptures shed a revealing and searching light. In the biblical vocabulary the word "spirit" does not mean the thought or intelligence of man. The spirit is in the first place that which communicates human life to the human being as to every living thing. But this spirit has no autonomous existence, it is not independent. At the beginning, in God's creation, the life which man received by the spirit was given him by a permanent communion of God with the Holy Spirit. By his spirit held in submission to the Holy Spirit, man knew his God, and obeyed Him in the liberty of love. In the Fall man sought to free himself from his dependence, but in fact he abandoned his liberty of spirit which essentially consists in his power of living before God and of knowing everything through Him. The spirit of man cannot be independent: in turning aside from the One Who truly inspires him he has become the slave of evil spirits, of all the powers of heaven or earth which surround him and spy upon him in the cosmic disorder which comes upon the world and which the Bible enumerates or sums up under the general term of "spirit of the world". A nation or a civilisation can perfectly distinguish spiritual values which are certain in the eyes of men, but are in submission to the spirit of the world. In Jesus Christ alone, Who is the Truth and the foundation of all real knowledge of man and of the world, and through the Holy Spirit, can the human spirit be liberated from slavery to evil spirits, and receive the power to submit to the Spirit of God, which is a "spirit of wisdom and revelation". Through the Holy Spirit power is given to man to know in Jesus Christ the end of all things as his own end. Besides every man is faced with this choice: to remain a slave of the spirits of this world, or to yield, through the Holy Spirit, to the knowledge of God and to liberty, since "where the Spirit of God is, there is liberty." Man who lives in faith is invited each day of his life to make the choice, to "believe not every spirit, but try the spirits whether they are of God" (I John 4: 1).

Many different spirits may reign in the University: the postulates of science or of culture are signs of them. The Christian man is called to discern them that he may submit to those alone which recognise the authority of their Creator. This does not mean that there are no spiritual values but religious ones. Everything belongs to Christ; which means that there is neither sacred nor profane. Art and literature, the drama and law are all

spiritual values: but they may be animated by false spirits or by true, by demons or by the Holy Spirit. It is our part to choose which we shall serve, and which we would have our country serve with all its cultural and spiritual inheritance.

Faith and culture

This faces us with a question of the highest importance. If the service of the spirit of man can only be actually achieved in submission to the Holy Spirit, that is because there is a culture and a scientific research whose deepest inspiration can only come from the preaching of the Holy Spirit. This does not mean that faith has to dictate to science its methods and its results, but that it is able to submit them to the Holy Spirit. And if this is really true, one is led to suppose that a University founded upon this faith is a thing to hope for. Of course we may have reserves about the possibility or the opportunity for such a realisation. Yet can there be elsewhere than in Jesus Christ a community with deep roots? Can there exist save in submission to the Holy Spirit a veritable service of the spirit of man? It seems as if such a University might be a witness in the world to a real service of the spirit of man.

The University in the common life

It is in serving the spirit of man that the University also serves men. It is not an isolated community in the nation or in the civilised world. It plays its part in regional and national life, as well as life on a wider scale. We have seen that the service of the spirit must always be the service of an incarnate spirit. The University accomplishes its work in a certain place and at a certain moment of history. It is its aim and its duty to animate the existence of the men and the communities with which and of whose life it lives. It is certain, for instance, that in these times when the national life has profound reality, a French University must serve the national community. There is a history, a conception of life, a tradition, a culture in France which the University is called to give its true place, to rediscover, to continue. It must undertake the responsibility of nourishing the spiritual life of the country. In doing this it will share in the fulfilment of its own particular mission, among the people to which it belongs, and will serve other nations as well. For too long a period the University has remained in its ivory tower,

believing that it should or indeed could escape earthly contingencies. It is time for it to resume its place and its function in common life.

But the University can only in reality serve men if it is in truth dedicated to the service of the spirit of man. This is no matter of restoring the easiest or the most comfortable life to men, or of misleading them with regard to existence. The University is there to remind them that *human* life cannot exist save in the service of the spirit, to make them recollect the needs of the spirit, and to assure the permanence of spiritual values.

We have seen that this service of the spirit of man only finds its true direction in submission to the Holy Spirit. It is this fact which lays upon us who are Christians so peculiar and so imperative a responsibility.

A Faith for the University

ARNOLD S. NASH

In a previous article in this issue Jean Bosc has dealt with the important question of the mission of the university. To read his essay is immediately to be precipitated into a consideration of the complementary problem of where shall the university derive the content of its mission, its message.

The end of an order

The "modern" world has come to an end. In economic life, it began with the transformation of feudalism into "free" merchant capitalism; it is ending with the transition from finance-monopoly capitalism into state-controlled collectivism. In political life, it began with the collapse of Christendom as a political unit to produce the modern nation-state; it is ending with some type of "New Order" based on a limitation of national sovereignty.¹

The world of scholarship has not escaped. The "modern" world, intellectually speaking, began with the emergence of the experimental method in science and the critical view of history as patterns for correct thinking when scholastic philosophy with its three-fold division into natural, mental and moral philosophy, collapsed. We moderns smile at such a division of the university curricula and still more at the attendant *trivium* of grammar, rhetoric and logic and the *quadrivium* of arithmetic, geometry, music and astronomy. But is not God already rebuking us for our superiority by showing by events that our contemporary division of human knowledge as indicated by the contents of the contemporary university catalogue is equally out of date? Indeed such catalogues are becoming like those medieval maps which

¹If this process is not brought to its conclusion then not merely "modern" history but "human" history will end in World War III.

adorn the walls of country houses in England; they have decorative value but for practical purposes serious revision is needed. In short the modern university, having fashioned its thinking for every subject in its curriculum on the natural sciences, must now face the fact that this model of correct thinking is no better fitted to explain (let alone change) the contemporary world than the scholastic model was adequate for the intellectual demands of a world built on rising capitalism.

A faith for a new order

From whence shall the university of the coming new order derive its sustenance for its future task? Liberal democratic culture itself is powerless precisely because it has not yet given up its proud self-confidence that it can save itself. It still believes that if man is not perfect, he is, like the world itself, nevertheless improving and that science, as the only way of reaching truth is the main agent whereby—through education—this process can be maintained. In a day when the optimistic presuppositions of a culture are so obviously at variance with the fate of the civilisation on which that culture depends, it is clear that a fresh source of wisdom is needed. And from where can that wisdom come unless it be from a re-interpretation of a faith, Christianity, which has outlasted the fall of, and therefore has a source beyond, many civilisations?

Western civilisation at the present juncture is not unlike imperial Rome during the third century. In each case a tremendous social structure has had no purpose outside its own maintenance and that is why in each age the learned men have sought refuge in cynicism whilst the common people, in fear of the unknown, have followed astrologers and the like. In Gibbon's famous words, all religions, like all philosophies, were to the learned equally false, to the ignorant equally true, and to the magistrates equally useful.

Imperial Rome, seeking a faith which could justify its existence, seized upon Christianity and under Constantine sought to achieve the imperial dream of permanent peace by harnessing the force of the growing Christian Church. However it was in vain. Rome fell but Christianity produced Augustine to lay the spiritual and indeed the intellectual foundations of a culture that for nearly a thousand years shone brilliantly in literature, painting, architecture and philosophy.

The crisis of culture

But that culture, too, reached its crisis. To translate literally the Greek word *krisis* (from which we get our anglicised *crisis*), *judgment* was uttered over medieval culture and it collapsed. Judgment is the perennial fate of all cultures. It is the time in the affairs of men, nations or civilisations when their shortcomings can no longer be ignored and they are called to account. Particularly is this true of the thought of an epoch for then the unforeseen tendencies of its theories, their inner contradictions and their ultimate conclusions, become evident not only because new light is thrown upon them but mainly because they reveal themselves as inadequate in their application. Moreover we can say that each crisis in the life of nations, universities, churches or civilisations is the expression of a judgment on the ideas that have inspired them. However, crisis is something more than judgment. For a time of crisis is also one of opportunity. The Chinese (and, following them the Japanese) in their wisdom make up the ideography equivalent to the English "crisis" by using two characters. One means opportunity and the other means danger.

Under the leadership of Augustine, the Christian Church in the early years of the Fifth Century was enabled to seize its opportunities and steer a passage amid the dangers of the Gothic invasions of the Empire. Can contemporary Christian thinkers perform for their day and generation the equivalent of Augustine's service to declining Rome? Can they ensure that, in the coming intellectual reconstruction, a new interpretation of the specifically Christian insights into the nature of man and the significance of the historical process will replace the twin pillars of the optimistic view of human nature and the inevitability of progress upon which—in spite of their shaky foundations—the structure of modern knowledge was built?

In the midst of a revolution

The answer is that they can if they will only recognise that we do *really* live in a revolutionary situation. For the World's Student Christian Federation this means that it is no use proclaiming, for example, that the political order must be reconstructed or that industry must be basically reformed. As J. H. Oldham has pointedly reminded us, the besetting sin of Chris-

tians is to draw up blue prints in spheres where they have no control instead of attempting a few reforms in spheres where they have.

This plainly means that the Federation, like its constituent movements, must recognise and act upon the recognition that it is itself in a revolutionary phase. It can either accept that fact and seek under God *consciously* to guide its destiny in the world now being born or it can proceed *unconsciously* on the basis of conviction that although industry, politics, the universities, the Churches and so on, must be revolutionised yet the Federation can carry on unchanged by the forces which precipitated the present cataclysm.

We can be humbly thankful to God for the signs of the times which indicate that the Student Christian Movements throughout the world are recognising what is nothing less than God's call for our time; it is to undertake a mission *to the University* and not just to its students. It was graphically put in our Chairman's letter when last year he wrote:

"Let no one think that the problem of the post-war world is essentially a technical problem and that a bit of political engineering will settle the issue. For there can be no order without a common 'frame of reference'. And the real problem which we must face is the spiritual one as to what will be the main common convictions which will underlie the coming order."¹

In other words, Dr. Visser 't Hooft is challenging us to accept the responsibility which our Editor had in mind when he chose the title "Thinking Together as Christians" for a subsequent issue of THE STUDENT WORLD.

A living idea

This recognition that the crying need of the time is, to use T. S. Eliot's phrase, to think in Christian categories, is not limited to our officers. It is a *living* idea that repeatedly crops up in the literature of the national movements. Perhaps its most moving expression is Daniel Jenkins' "sermon" in the *British Student Movement*² with the title *Babel and Jerusalem: Evangelism in the University* and on the text, "bringing every thought into the captivity of Christ" (II Cor. 10: 5). His warning is salutary

¹THE STUDENT WORLD, Fourth Quarter, 1941, p. 283.

²June, 1942.

to those of us who would rush ahead with that self-confidence which shows how much the rust of a liberal capitalist culture has eaten into our souls. He writes:

"We have hardly begun to understand how comprehensive is our Lord's claim over our minds, nor have we yet known enough of His power to be honestly certain that it is 'mighty to the casting down of strongholds'. No people are more guilty of making large claims and doing very little to justify them than Christians in these days and in the university of all places we should cultivate a proper sobriety. It is not wise to challenge Pharaoh's magicians to turn their staffs into serpents unless we are absolutely sure for ourselves that our serpents are able to eat theirs.

"There is no short cut to saving the university, and the road to its salvation is a long and stony one. Our only effective form of evangelism is to behave ourselves like Christians in the sphere which is the distinctive concern of the university, that of the mind."

In so-called "practical" terms this living idea of "Christian thinking" as distinct from "thinking about Christian subjects" appears in the American movement in the frequency with which the question appears: "What is the difference between thinking as a Christian and thinking as a Marxist when both want an economy planned for the common good?"

Educating the professors

In Canada this living idea was expressed in the remarks of a student of McGill University at a recent conference to the effect that the task of the S.C.M. is "to educate the professors and build an S.C.M. into the University". It is also in Canada that it has received its expression in terms which carry the most disturbing implications, disturbing not to truth but to our traditions. One of its secretaries in conversation with the writer, raised the question of whether the study circle method, characteristic of the British and the Canadian movements, may not simply be the expression of our adherence to a liberal Protestant philosophy of religious education. That philosophy is now outworn; might it not be, he added, that if we adopt a neo-orthodox philosophy of religious education then we shall have to adopt a technique as

different from study circles as Reinhold Niebuhr's theology is different from that of Horace Bushnell?¹

The analysis which lay behind this question is of more than Canadian significance. It touches at the root of the dilemma in which any Christian movement finds itself in any university in our liberal democratic culture, viz., how can a movement which takes its stand on revealed knowledge speak in intelligible terms to a university which bases itself explicitly on secular knowledge, and often by implication denies the possibility or at least the relevance of revealed knowledge? The Canadian S.C.M. secretary in question then went on to point out that so long as the S.C.M. is implicitly liberal Protestant in its theology then the dilemma does not appear, for liberal Protestantism removes the dilemma by removing revelation. Hence, in the past a study circle, in terms of this theology has been, not an instrument to proclaim a truth which the liberal democratic university does not know, but a field upon which both the Christian and the secular student can meet on a common ground because essentially they start from the same premises.

The university must glorify God

In the French S.C.M. utterance has been given to convictions as to the mission of the S.C.M. to the university in terms which are strikingly similar to the analyses of this Canadian leader. Just before the war began, a conference on "The Christian University" was held at Bièvres; it recorded its conclusion that

"essential as it is, it is not enough to proclaim the Gospel to students and to glorify God *in* the University; but the university itself must also glorify God, and our studies must themselves be offered as a sacrifice to God. Too often we are content to say and to go on saying that science and philosophy and all the wisdom of this world cannot bring salvation to man. We ought to tell the university that it does not know—how indeed should it know?—what it means for a Christian to be a scholar, to be a philosopher, to be an historian. We have no difficulty in renouncing all such heresies as 'Christian' science or 'Christian' philosophy; but we cannot give up seeking what God demands of us when He gives us a vocation to be scholars, philosophers, and historians."

¹The founder of liberal Protestant religious education in the U.S.A.

On the other side of the world this living idea is struggling to break through the traditional modes of thinking and conduct within the Federation. Space demands that I limit myself to Australia and the line of argument to which Kurt Schechner has given such lucid utterance.¹ He points out that in the intellectual realm as Christian students we must discover the relevance of Christian presuppositions to our secular knowledge. He illustrated his thesis by considering law, history, economics and biology and he made the all-important point that within this sphere it is to Christian laymen among scientists, historians, psychologists and the like that we must look to become what Alan Richardson of the British S.C.M. aptly calls "lay-theologians".

A task for the Federation

What therefore is the conclusion of the matter? Is it not that the Federation must take the lead among the Christian forces of the world in working out a Christian world-view within which the conclusions of the specialised subjects of the university curriculum can be given their ultimate meaning in terms of a specifically Christian philosophy of man and of his relation to the historical process? There is no other organisation in Christendom which has such intimate and world wide contacts with the Christians who as scientists, historians and scholars are the only people who can do it. Perhaps in making this appeal I am echoing the argument of our chairman when he concluded his essay on *Christianity and the University World in None Other Gods* with the words "we need very specially a Christian Professors' Movement". His remarks embodied what was then (in 1937) a prophecy. Is it not today God's word of command to the Federation as it attempts to discover the part it should play in the future "New Order"? The Federation can only fulfil its mission to the university in so far as through its constituent movements it can unite both professors and students to undertake a four-fold task:

1. to discover an answer not only to the question: "How can we as individuals serve God in the University?" but also to the question: "How can the liberal democratic University itself be a witness to the Glory of God?"

¹See report of a speech at the Sydney University S.C.M. Conference, May, 1940, recorded in *The Australian Intercollegian*, Volume XLIII, pp. 105-07.

2. to discover the meaning of Christian vocation for a man or woman who is a chemist, sociologist, historian, psychologist, mathematician and the like.
3. to apply Christian criteria in working out the presuppositions which are relevant to the study of individual academic subjects and to discover the place in a Christian *speculum mentis* of the knowledge given in such specialised subjects.
4. to work towards a synthesis of knowledge for the twentieth century which, as an interpretation of human life and destiny, can be set over against the positivistic or Marxist or liberal humanitarian *Weltanschauungen* now current in the liberal democratic world. Such a *speculum mentis* will be dialectical between the two poles of unity and freedom. Like scholasticism it will derive its unity from its theological basis which will provide its presuppositions. But it will differ from scholasticism in that the specifically theological sections of such a map will not determine the nature and character of the "non-theological" sections. God, not theology or any other system, is sovereign.

The Crisis in the American Universities

CLARENCE P. SHEDD

"'Education and scholarship as usual' is no slogan for these days," says President James B. Conant of Harvard, and with this statement one can hardly disagree. Obviously, total war forces the colleges to abandon the "ivory tower" and make radical changes in their ways of living, course offerings, and instructional methods. In that sense "education as usual" is an inadequate slogan. The exigencies of this moment, however, pose a deeper problem for the colleges; will they be so overwhelmed by the demands of the armed forces for training that they will betray the vocation of the college? Will they cheat this present generation of students by failing to share with them the culture of the past and to prepare them for their part in a post-war reconstruction based on a just and durable peace? Is it an adequate view of the total demands of total war that, as Dr. Conant told Harvard freshmen on October 6, "only a trace of the broadening background of a liberal arts college curriculum can survive these grim days"? Must we wait, as Dr. Conant further suggests, "until the war is won . . . for the true purpose of education again to be in the forefront"? Are the colleges and universities to become merely or solely "military academies", "war colleges", or "trade schools"? Are propaganda and training—much of it subcollegiate in character—to take the place of education? Who dictates what the colleges are to teach?

In an address to his incoming freshmen, President Alexander G. Ruthven of the University of Michigan criticised the "misguided zeal" of educators who "would make war colleges out of our educational institutions". "If we orient and rigidly align our students in war work, . . . we will become trade schools. The universities," he said, "have a responsibility to turn out citizens who can function in a democracy as well as to train 'fighting men'. . . ."

"Let the College be the College"

Never has higher education faced so grave a crisis. For the college can play the all-out part it desires to play in winning the war and the peace, only if it is free to function in its own character, performing collegiate, not subcollegiate, functions. The words "Let the college be the college" should be written in large letters over every administrative desk "for the duration". Much education as usual must go forward, no matter how heavy the demands for military training which total war places upon our colleges.

These questions come to the colleges and universities with a terrifying sense of urgency. Since January administrators have been working on a plan, approved by the Selective Service and by Army and Navy, which with accelerated programme and Enlisted Reserves geared the colleges completely into the total war effort, created a reservoir of leaders for the armed forces, and made possible for most students the completion of the college course before induction into the armed forces. The events of the past two months have destroyed this carefully erected house of cards. In late August the 500 educators assembled in Washington for the National Institute of Education and War were told that the "keystone of present national policy", as adopted by the Man Power Commission, was that "every able-bodied student was destined for the armed forces", that "all students were living on borrowed time". Then came President Roosevelt's Columbus Day speech, followed by Congressional action to lower the draft age to eighteen.

A coherent national policy is needed

"Let us be realistic," said Lieut.-Gen. Brehon B. Somervell. "Every classroom is a citadel. . . . The colleges must help to equip the student for his place in the armed forces regardless of cost, time, inconvenience, temporary sidetracking of non-war objectives, or even the temporary scrapping of peace-time courses." On September 10 and 17 these statements were given more official standing for the War Department when Secretary Henry L. Stimson declared that by the end of the term or semester beginning in September, all students in the army reserves who have reached selective service age would be called to active duty, regardless of their status under the accelerated plan. Moreover, the colleges were warned by Mr. McNutt that

the forces of government expected the colleges to bring down to a minimum all courses without immediate utility in the preparation of students for the armed forces.

Panic followed these declarations, for agreements made by the colleges with their students in good faith suddenly seemed to have become "scraps of paper". "The best way to lose the war is to draft all youthful brain power now," wrote President Charles G. Turck, of Macalester College. With the lowering of the draft age to 18, there appeared to be little chance that many students now in college could secure their degrees.

President Henry Wriston of Brown denounced the statements by Secretary Stimson "as a clear reversal of War Department policy". He pleaded for some coherent national policy, for "since the advent of the crisis the colleges and their students had been subjected to a barrage of advice and instruction, conflicting statements, warnings and threats by public officials and military officers", making the "task of the college needlessly difficult".

It is a striking and sobering fact that stronger protests have come from the large state universities and smaller church-related colleges than from the older private universities. Perhaps the most searching and yet constructive protest came from President Frank Graham of the University of North Carolina in a telegram sent to the Secretary of War on September 11 (the day following Secretary Stimson's statement), "reaffirming the university's all-out service to win the war" but pointing out "the obligation of the university not only to prepare men for the armed forces but to train all the necessary technicians and professional experts and leaders in every field of duty of war and for the humane and hopeful work of reconstruction after the war". Calling for a united "federal plan and programme", Dr. Graham on behalf of the University Board of Overseers said: "We must bespeak your leadership for a total training programme for a total war", stating further that "without the support of the back lines of agriculture, industry, commerce, education and the professions there will be no front lines." Here is a point of view and a platform to which all can subscribe who believe that, in "an all-out service to win the war and the peace", the college has a responsibility vastly greater than that of offering pre-induction courses, imperative as may be the need for these. It also has a realism about the total university job and the undergraduate situation not found in the statements of many presidents or officers of government.

These facts are basic

While the colleges and universities wait for some coherent national policy freeing them for "all-out service", they may well remind themselves of certain factors regarding the immediate situation which form the background against which they formulate their immediate, if not long-range, policies.

(1) The colleges must be given the green light to proceed unhampered with their work of preparing men and women for *all the tasks of war and reconstruction and of educating students for life and the tasks of citizenship*. Otherwise the incentives to enter or remain in college will be greatly weakened and there will be disaster for many of our institutions of higher education and an impoverishment of our culture for the future.

(2) However large and numerous the special training units, their presence should not obscure the fact that these special units are following officers' training programmes of their own and under the complete control—however great may be the university's contribution—of the branch of the armed forces involved and that alongside of the work of these training units the college or university, in most of its departments, is carrying on its normal task of educating youth as usual. In most of the large middle western universities—except for some crowding and inconvenience—the programmes of special officers' training and of "education as usual" go on side by side, to a large degree independent of each other.

(3) It is a fair guess that even if there is long delay in evolving a single coherent national policy, the colleges throughout the present year will have a fair proportion of the students who have entered for regular college work. Hence there rests upon the colleges a heavy obligation to "continue as institutions of higher education". We dare not betray the students or the future by any lowering of the quality of our work. In the meantime some national plan for assignment or deferment may keep many of them in college longer than we now believe. Many of those now in college, whether in the enlisted reserves or not, are likely to be allowed to remain after they become of draft age to continue types of special education that the college can better give than the Army or Navy. One cannot therefore colour too strongly the instruction of such regular students with courses which are of a pre-induction character for the armed forces.

If we can learn from the experience of British universities we will discover ways of keeping the flow of students into the universities, stabilising their finances, and alongside of officer training keep going much of the work of *education as usual*.

(4) The presence of women students in the great majority of institutions of higher learning forces those institutions to continue for both men and women most of the fundamental courses in the arts and sciences and education. Neither the widening array of war service courses for women nor the opening up of opportunities in war industries nor in the armed forces alters this obligation to continue the basic work of education now and for the duration. On women will rest heavy burdens for leadership in post-war reconstruction. The colleges must get ready *now*.

(5) The institutions of higher learning have a sacred responsibility to defend the sciences and arts from complete pre-occupation or expropriation for the immediate ends of total war. If the lights of civilisation are to continue to burn, however dimly, then efforts to limit the work of education and scholarship wholly to technological and scientific disciplines must be stoutly resisted. It is proper to respond to the request of government for such special courses as help the armed forces and the war industries win this total war, but it is a betrayal of the present and the future for the colleges to allow such immediate new tasks to blot out the contributions which the humanities and arts have to make to the winning of this total war and to training for reconstruction. It is a false view of social change to believe that you leave the works of construction to be started after the works of destruction are ended. Rather, destruction and construction go on together, and failure to begin now the work of reconstruction and the training for after-war leadership in them may lead us again into a situation where we win a war and lose a peace.

The College must find itself

We need much clearer thinking than we have a right to expect from those who deal solely with the man power problem of the armed forces about what it is that really prepares young men and young women to take their part in this total war. How can the colleges respond adequately to President Roosevelt's stir-

ring challenge to "help us mould men and women who can fight through to victory"? How can the colleges answer his "prayer", "that young people will learn in the schools and colleges the . . . forbearance and patience needed by men and women of good will who seek to bring to this earth a lasting peace?" Certainly not alone or primarily by centering on pre-induction courses for service in the armed forces. Certainly not by making "a citadel out of every classroom" or substituting tactics for classes.

Never has it been more important that the college find itself and assert its true vocation in a war-torn world. Welcoming new students at the University of Chicago on September 22, President Robert M. Hutchins declared: "I reject in strongest terms Mr. McNutt's assertion that non-essential courses must be replaced by subjects of immediate utility in winning the war. . . . Technology will not solve all our problems . . . nor will technology establish a just and lasting peace. What will win the war and establish a lasting peace are educated citizens. The courses which will be of greatest utility in winning the war are not those of immediate practical utility but those which teach you as citizens to think."

Lord Bryce, speaking of a moment of history as dark as the present, said: "We must serve our day without yielding to it." If our colleges play their total part in this total war, they will not only give all-out preparation for the nation's armed forces but will lift higher than ever those disciplines of mind and spirit which create intelligence, imagination, spiritual insight and moral courage, enabling leaders to arise who "hope for" and "do the best things in the most calamitous times"—rebuilding, even while the work of destruction goes on. Only so can there be hope of a time "when the lights go on again all over the world".

Rebuilding a Chinese University¹

CHANG KUO-HSING

Kunming, the provincial capital of Yunnan, has recently come into the limelight. Until a few years back, it was a city of little worth and fame, though about two thousand years ago the famous warriors of the Three Kingdoms marched on its narrow streets. Kunming has now emerged into national importance as a rear base for our war with Japan, a pivotal point in our gigantic plan of reconstruction and a nerve centre of communications in Free China. It was here that General Tang Chi Yao first raised the voice of opposition that echoed and re-echoed throughout the length and breadth of China against the counter-revolution for the restoration of the monarchical system in China in 1915.

An ancient and modern environment

Kunming is now a new city, prosperous, vibrant with business activities, with modern streamlined limousines whizzing through its streets, which are overlaid with flat blocks of limestone. It truly has the appearance of a senile old man rejuvenated with some monkey glands! Reconstruction is being strenuously carried on in spite of the war. Towering buildings of modern structure are springing up like mushrooms. Cinema halls and other amusements are available. Wedged between the ancient battered city walls in the western outskirts and the mighty range of mountains that runs a complete circle around the plateau on which Kunming is built, enveloping within its folds the picturesque Kunming Loch, is a cluster of small rectangular blocks of mud-sheds, all of a makeshift character, some with thatched roofs and others covered with corrugated iron, presenting an appearance of Army Barracks. Therein lies one of the highest seats of learning in Free China—the National South West Associated University, widely recognised as the leading Chinese university!

The environment has poetic inspiration. The ancient wall is an unfailing reminder of the ancient greatness of China; the mighty mountain range inspires us with lofty ideals and ambi-

¹This interesting account was written in October, 1940.

tions; and the serene sky above crowns us with clarity of vision and rationality in thought! Such inspirational environment compensates us to a certain extent for our material lacks.

Three Universities in one

The National South West Associated University, or Lienta in abbreviated form, is composed of three of the foremost universities of China—the National Peking University, the Tsinghua University, and Nankai. After the outbreak of the war, the three universities moved *en masse* to Changsha, where for reasons of attaining greater efficiency and convenience they were incorporated into one Provisional Associated University. But before long they were compelled to move again. This time they moved to Kunming, which is rendered inaccessible to the Nipponese by natural mountain barriers, and were re-christened the National South West Associated University. Of course, such an association or amalgamation is only a provisional arrangement to meet wartime conditions. At the conclusion of the war Lienta will separate into the three original universities again.

Thus after a long, tedious march from Peiping to Kunming of over two thousand miles, a distance of the whole length of the United States from East to West, we are again able to settle down to our studies. This long march is a sorrowful, but significant chapter of hardships and courageous deeds in the educational history of China. When we arrived here in 1938, we thought that at long last we had reached our haven of refuge, where we could study our books in peace. But recent bombings in Kunming have belied our hopes! Kunming is merely an inn, where we can only stop for a short rest and change our post horses. We may have to move on, again! Oh! Poor Lienta! You are really a nomadic university! But, come what may, we are ready to face any situation. We are determined to keep in healthy circulation the educational strain in the blood of our New China.

Shortage of books

Since our University moved to Kunming, we have been facing the big problem of material insufficiency, such as the shortage in housing accommodation, of laboratory equipment, of books, etc. We also don't have enough professors. The shortage in

classrooms and professors has made necessary large unwieldy classes, sometimes of over 400 students. In respect to laboratory equipment, I may say that the only equipment we have for a biological experiment class of over a hundred students is a few microscopes. The shortage of books is our greatest problem and is our most serious handicap in the pursuit of knowledge. Our library is very poorly supplied with books. A few months ago, we received a gift of over a thousand books from Oxford University and you can imagine what a tremendous gift it is! The shortage is specially serious in regard to reference books. For instance, for two Western History classes of over 700 students we have only three copies of World History, by Hayes, Moon and Wayland. Hence there is a perpetual scramble to borrow reference books from our library. In order to ensure against disappointment, many students have to go to the library half an hour before it is opened. They have to line up outside the library door in a long "book queue". This kind of book queue is perhaps unknown outside China.

The books in our library are as jealously guarded as treasures. To borrow a book is a serious commitment! We have to surrender to the librarian our student's certificate, which is our most important possession in college. We have to return the book before the library is closed. We are not permitted to take it out. Violation of this regulation is considered one of the highest offences against the school, punishable in the first degree. The magazine section of our library is never known to have a journal which can be considered to be reasonably up-to-date. The latest paper from the nearest place is always at least two weeks behind time. Our contact with the outside world is really negligible. We feel as if we are shut up in a dark cell of intellectual isolation. Sometimes we even feel that we are in a vacuum. Such conditions greatly hamper us in our pursuit of knowledge.

Our classrooms are either makeshift mudsheds or some battered rooms in a dilapidated building. In America, they would have to undergo extensive repairs in order to be suitable as garages. The rooms are too small for our unusually large classes. Many students have to stay outside the classroom and sit down on the ground to take notes. There are students who have attended lectures for the whole semester without having the chance to see the face of the professor, because they have to stay outside the lecture room for all the lectures.

A scrambling life

Such an all-round shortage has cultivated a fast tempo of life of an American type among our student body. They have to scramble hard for almost everything. Life in Lienta is really a continuous scramble! We don't give any precedence or gentlemanly treatment to our co-eds. There is no "lady first" in our campus. They have to rush for it too!

Our dormitories are mostly mudsheds. They would certainly be swept from the ground if we had anything similar to an American hurricane. We are billeted in an army manner. Our beds are like bunks in a ship, one above the other. The floors of our dormitories are neither cemented nor floored with timber planks, just bare ground. They would not be considered sanitary or good as cowsheds in America. But, perhaps, the worst point about our dormitories is the congestion! In a room of about 100 feet by 20 feet, forty students are "chucked" in, packed like herrings in a barrel.

We don't have our tables covered with table cloths, neither do we have napkins nor comfortable chairs to sit on. Never did have! In our dining halls, or dining sheds (to be more accurate), we only have square tables, all ramshackle affairs, inclining to one side or the other, depending on which leg is weaker; and we don't have any chairs at all! We have to take our food standing up and try to make the best we can of the situation.

Definitely underfed

Our daily food is of very low caloric value. We are subsisting on a diet that is 99% vegetarian, because the price of meat is prohibitive! Our food costs \$15.00¹ (national currency) a month, which is only 80¢ (American) according to the present rate of exchange. I wonder if 80¢ is sufficient to pay for a single dinner in America. Calculating on \$15.00 (national currency) a month, it will mean that the food per student per day will cost 50¢—50¢ for three meals! Out of the 50¢, 40¢ goes to pay for the rice, because rice has gone up tremendously in price since the start of the war. Only 10¢ remains for vegetables to go with three meals! From this, one can gain an idea of the extent of poverty in our food. Definitely, we are underfed and it is common for students to contract diseases resulting from undernourishment.

¹These are 1940 figures. [Ed.].

This is all caused by the poor financial position in which the majority of the students find themselves. They can't afford to pay for any better food. A great part of them come from the Japanese occupied areas, where any properties which their families have been able to build up through years of hard toil have been ruthlessly destroyed by the Japanese. Now they have to depend upon the Government. The relief is far from adequate. Thus it is really a problem for them to make ends meet. If each of them could only have 20¢ U.S. more, they would be able to eke out a humanly satisfactory life! But, alas! for them to find 20¢ U.S. is impossible. Our Government already being heavily burdened financially for the war is unfortunately not able to do anything more for them. They will still have to go on subsisting on a semi-starvation or semi-destitute basis.

Few students are well dressed, of course, and here I don't mean to imply any foolish sense. Most of the students wear long gowns made of coarse blue cloth, which is cheap as well as dirt-proof, so as to minimise laundry expenses. It is a common sight in our Campus to see students dressed in clothes patched all over like the patched rags of coolies on the wharves. Some students can only afford to have a haircut once in two months.

We have very few sports, no soccer and no tennis! We have only one basketball court and two miniature football fields for our 3,500 students. We have no college papers, and there are very few outside magazines to which our students can contribute articles. So the only avenue left for our students in which to practise their literary skill is to contribute to wall newspapers of which we have many on our Campus.

An army of bookworms

But "wartimisation" has produced at least one beneficial effect. The serious and solemn atmosphere it has cultivated is strongly conducive to diligent study. The atmosphere has made us care more for our lessons. It has produced an army of bookworms among our student body. In consequence, Lienta students are well-known for their attachment to books and Lienta is famous as a nest of budding scholars.

We are working very hard. We have very heavy class work. The students with the lightest class work have to attend at least twenty-four hours of lectures a week. Our engineering students have to do more than thirty-five hours. American students may

call this drudgery! Our heavy class work has left us with very little time for outside supplementary reading. But then we don't need to have too much time, because our poor library has very few books for us to read.

We have many dramatic societies in our college. Occasionally, they put on variety concerts, which though not very accomplished in artistic or dramatic value are a satisfactory display of histrionic talents. At least, they have relieved many of our poor students of the expenses of going to amusements in the town. These dramatic societies usually do not possess sufficient funds to purchase their paraphernalia, so sometimes they have to use blankets as curtains!

Our freshmen are required to undergo three hours' military training a week in accordance with the National Defence Scheme. Their daily life is subjected to a modified form of military discipline. But nothing is required that will unduly interfere with their studies.

Serving our country

One of our most popular war slogans is: don't forget to serve your country even in your studies. This slogan has great influence on our lives. As we are poring over our books, we, all the same, think of serving our country. When our vacations come, we group ourselves together for services to our country. Usually, we organise propaganda excursions into the villages, wherein lies the life and flows the blood of our New China. Our propaganda does not merely centre on anti-Japanism as is generally supposed, but equal emphasis is laid on soil cultivation and mass education in every possible respect.

Thus, in spite of the physical hardships and material insufficiency, our Lienta is still going strong, undaunted and undeterred! We are proud to be her students, even though to be her students means to suffer. Life may be an ordeal to us! We may not be able to enjoy life, but we can and will study, and in the long run it is knowledge that counts for a college student. We will not allow ourselves to be daunted by the possibility that our cluster of small rectangular mudsheds with all our worldly possessions in them may one day be razed to the ground by Japanese planes. We are determined to keep up our study morale, just as our comrades at the front are determined to keep up their fighting morale.

More Questions for Thinking Ahead

A message from a group of students, meeting at Présinge, near Geneva, 2nd-4th September, 1942

On this third anniversary of the outbreak of war in Europe, a small group of Christian students, representing six different countries, has been able to meet in Switzerland for a Federation conference. We are conscious of our privilege, and we should like to say to those who have not been able to join with us that we feel ourselves to be in close communion with them. We wish also to express our gratitude for the work done at Poughkeepsie,¹ which has served as a basis for our discussions. Considering the distance in space and time which separates us from Poughkeepsie, it is inevitable that we should approach some problems from a slightly different angle, but you have given our thoughts a fruitful impulse.

Our discussions have been affected by the terrible events which are taking place even while we meet. Europe is in a state of confusion and chaos which is beyond the imagination of those who have not been living in it.

Five students have prepared this document, in which they have sought especially to emphasise certain points which do not seem to them to have been adequately dealt with in the Poughkeepsie document. They hope that their comrades in other lands will help them to study these problems more deeply, and to state them more clearly.

1. *Christian ethics*

The problem of the fundamental basis of Christian ethics presents itself to us today in a very different way from that in pre-war Europe. In the occupied countries convinced Christians find themselves in situations where they are forced to recognise that the moral conceptions which have seemed sufficient till now cannot help them to solve the concrete problems which face them. The Bible does not provide us with ready-made solutions, it does not state general principles which will be applicable in every particular case; but it does give us certain indications as to what the Christian attitude must be in the face of moral conflicts. It demands of us concrete decisions. It is our duty to discern the will of God in every situation—what is in accordance with His will is the *truth*.

¹For the report of the Poughkeepsie conference see THE STUDENT WORLD, Third Quarter, 1942.

It may happen, for example, that in order to act in conformity with the will of God revealed to us in Jesus Christ, we have in certain circumstances to tell a lie. Some of us have had to lie to save a life or to prevent another from committing a crime. Some of us who a few months ago would have shrunk from breaking the law, would do so unhesitatingly today to save a refugee.

Such examples show that good and evil are not conventional ideas or autonomous realities. Christian ethics is not based on universal laws, or on a moral idealism. It is concrete obedience to the will of God.

Question: How does the Bible help us to discern this will of God which must determine our decisions?

2. *The basis of law*

The problem of law is perhaps the most fundamental which faces us; what are the biblical bases of law and justice?

We see with horror on the continent of Europe today what a world without law is like. Arbitrary sentences, mass deportations, violation of the right of sanctuary—all reveal the abyss which will soon engulf a world where law exists only to serve the ends of the strongest.

The complete upheaval of the whole tradition of continental Europe, the heritage of a civilisation interpenetrated by Christianity, faces us with a problem very different from that which faces the English-speaking countries. There the already existing standards of values survive, and their concern is to keep their life at the level of those standards. But for us all the so-called Christian standards have given way in the war. In the face of a rising anarchy solid foundations must be found.

We feel that for a "post-Christian" world like Europe the consequences of the destruction of human standards of value is much more serious than for a world that has never known Christianity. There is no salvation for Europe except in a return to the very origin of those standards.

Our former conceptions of law and justice were founded on a certain natural law, a theory of the rights of man, based on a simple belief in man as good and reasonable. Experience has shown how idealistic this conception was. Our task now is to seek what guiding lines are given us in the Bible—we think for example of the rights of foreigners in the Old Testament. There is no question there of a system, but of a word to which man must continually listen.

Question: What, in your opinion, are the biblical bases of law? Discuss the conception of natural law.

3. *Truth*

Another grave problem which faces us is the devaluation of the idea of truth. Truth is becoming for many people, a subjective conception which varies according to nation, class, or race. The question now is how to maintain or to rediscover in every university discipline the will to seek truth objectively, a will which is independent of all factors foreign to this discipline. The very existence of the university is at stake in this question.

For Christians, the question is how to find the connection between Truth, as the Word of God, and truth as the object of human research.

Question: In what does the search for truth consist for the Christian member of a university? Is his search different from that of a non-Christian?

4. *Judgment*

This war is a judgment pronounced upon the whole world, upon the Church, and upon every Christian. Nothing could be more tragic than that Christians and the Church should remain after the war what they were before. The judgment of God always comes upon us in the present, and calls us to repentance and to definite obedience.

We must take care not to seek to escape from this judgment by hiding ourselves in plans for the future, and by building an imaginary new order for after the war.

There is a danger that we may dream of a future state governed by Christian principles, and not listen to the word that God wants to say to us today, with all the immediate and concrete necessities which result from it.

Question: In what respects do present events appear like a judgment (1) on the world; (2) on the Church; (3) on our S.C.M.?

5. *Nationalism*

The peoples are engaged today in a struggle for existence, and they are in danger of seeing only the biological aspect of the struggle, of losing the sense of their own mission, of losing their souls. The nation is not a social group due to chance. It is God who calls the nations into existence, and gives to them their dignity and their tasks. We are inclined to lay too much emphasis on, and to overestimate, our national and political individuality. This attitude is opposed to the ecumenical Christian conception. In the occupied countries which are suffering under foreign domination this danger is particularly acute, as the concepts of political and Christian freedom tend to be the two sides of one and the same problem, and so are liable to be identified one with the other.

Question: How can the right relation be established between our ecumenical calling and our national calling, between the concern we have as Christians for the good of all peoples, and our particular responsibility for our own people?

6. *Human suffering*

Certain countries today are undergoing sufferings which can scarcely be imagined or conceived by those who are not exposed to them. When these sufferings are accepted as a trial sent by God (Hebrews 12: 11) they have a purifying effect. We have seen Christian churches fortified and purified by persecution. We have even seen nations without any Christian faith attaining, in the crucible of suffering, a quite new unity and solidarity. In this connection too we may speak of the purifying effect of suffering.

It is obvious however that suffering does not necessarily bring us nearer God. On the contrary we know that it can produce a terrible hardening of heart. The most terrible thing in the crisis through which Europe is passing is that this suffering seems to be so meaningless. We see young people today who have lost any sense of the value of human life.

We realise that the future will depend very largely on the fruits of the present suffering. We see too that the different reactions to this suffering will make mutual understanding very difficult. Those who have suffered most will have first right when the moment comes to rebuild Europe.

Question: How can we ourselves discover, and help others to see the blessing hidden in suffering? Is it possible for us to make ourselves interpreters of the suffering of other groups or other nations, and so to help towards mutual understanding?

7. *Hatred*

The horrors of the occupation, and the still worse horror of divisions within our countries bring us to a more realistic understanding of the commandment to love our enemies. We cannot hope to prevent the outbursts of hatred which will take place after the war against traitors to their countries or against the occupying forces.

The question arises therefore whether we have a right to hate our enemies. We cannot disembody evil. The Old Testament speaks violently of the enemies of God, and says of them that they are hated, and that the psalmist prays for their destruction. Yet the Bible reminds us that it is the sin which is hated, not the sinner. We cannot hate a human being.

The difficulty is that we are often tempted to consider our personal enemies as God's enemies. The violence of war tends to give predominance to the instinctive reactions and the emotional uprisings of hatred within us. Our spirit must therefore without ceasing control these reactions and a purification of our emotional reactions becomes more than ever necessary. It is only the will for justice that can authorise us to ask God to destroy His enemies.

On the other hand the real community of the Universal Church to which men of all countries belong does not allow us to think of a post-war settlement in which any country whatever shall be shut out from the international community.

Question: Is it the right or even the duty of a Christian to have enemies? Can these enemies be other than God's enemies? How can they be recognised?

8. *The Jewish question*

During the days we spent at Présinge we were once again led to concentrate our thoughts and our prayers in a very special way on the Jewish people. We knew indeed that at the very time we were meeting mass deportations were taking place in several countries. These measures, among the most appalling of the war, call forth all the love of one's neighbour and of humanity, which are left in the world. The Jewish question is especially important for still other reasons to the Christian Church. For the Jewish people, dispersed throughout the world, is a sign from God, and holds a unique place among the nations. God Himself gave it this place, for it was to the Jews that, after the Fall, God gave the promise that to them should be born the Saviour. In spite of the faithlessness into which the people of the promise often fell, God kept His word, and Jesus was born to the Jews. The Jews did not recognise in Him the Saviour, and the Christian Church was called to proclaim the promises of God. But Israel's rôle was not at an end because of this fact. God still has a plan for this people, and anyone who touches the Jews interferes in God's dealings with His people, and claims to be solving a problem the solution of which God has, in reality, kept for Himself.

The Christian Church opposes anti-semitism as it is bound to oppose oppression of any group of people by another (cf. oppression of coloured peoples by white) but it opposes anti-semitism particularly, on account of the special relation existing between the Jewish people and the Christian Church.

Question: What, according to the word of God (note Romans 11) is the special relation between the Jewish people and the Christian Church? What are the practical consequences of this relation

in so far as the personal attitude of the Christian to the Jews is concerned both on the plane of personal relationships and on the political plane?

Our last word about Europe today is not however only confusion and uncertainty. We see Christians and Christian churches bravely taking their stand and confessing their faith in Him Whose Kingdom is not of this world.

Our time is in dire need of prophets. We believe that today as in other times of crisis God has a prophetic message "for this generation" and that He is seeking instruments, men who will have the courage to stand alone against the world if need be like Amos or Jeremiah, to proclaim His judgments and His salvation to a world in distress. We would prepare ourselves for the coming of these prophets in a spirit of prayer, of expectancy, and of obedience. Perhaps it may be to one or other of us, Christian students of this generation, that the word of the Lord will come with an irresistible power.

"Behold, I make all things new." (Rev. 21 : 5.)

(These questions should be regarded as supplementary to the questions which appeared in the Third Quarter, 1942. The Third one on *Truth* is closely related to this issue of THE STUDENT WORLD. The Sixth one on *Suffering* is strikingly similar to the theme of the Call for the Universal Day of Prayer for Students. Some of the other questions will be the bases of articles in the Second Quarter, 1943.—Ed.)

Call for the Observance of the Universal Day of Prayer for Students

Sunday, 21st February, 1943

"WHO SHALL SEPARATE US FROM THE LOVE OF CHRIST? SHALL TRIBULATION, OR DISTRESS, OR PERSECUTION, OR FAMINE, OR NAKEDNESS, OR PERIL, OR SWORD?" Romans 8: 35.

These words of St. Paul reflect his own experience and that of the first Christians. They speak to us of the different ways in which suffering may meet a Christian, force him down into the deepest distress in life—doubt in the goodness of God, and make his heart hard and insensible. Suffering is always a serious temptation to desertion from the way of love and kindness. Very often it throws man back on himself and closes his eyes and heart to the needs and distress of his neighbour, making him concentrate on his own suffering, so that he does not see anything really but himself. All others, his neighbours, disappear out of sight.

Suffering is one of the most dangerous forces in life. Jesus Christ was once promised power and glory by the devil, if He fell down and worshipped him. When the Steadfast One did not yield to the temptation of earthly happiness, the tempter turned to disaster and suffering. This was his most dangerous weapon and the Lord was led into the most difficult temptation of His life. But He stood upright, He kept His fellowship with the Father unbroken and endured in obedience to the will of God and in love for a sinful and unhappy humanity.

Believing in Him, Who won His victory in temptation and hard suffering, St. Paul could write to his Christian brethren: What shall separate us from the love of Christ? . . . In Christian history we often meet people who in their lives are witnesses to the power and the certainty of faith, expressed in these words of the apostle.

In our own time they are miraculously relevant. Firstly as a description of the distress and the agony that evil insanity has spread over Christendom and humanity. Tribulation, distress, persecution, famine, nakedness, peril, sword—with these words the word of God describes our own time, filled to the brim with suffering. For those who are placed in the midst of this suffering, the temptation is great

and strong to be swept away by other forces in life than the spirit of Christ. And yet these other forces, which try to break down Christian faith and order, are not the most dangerous. Above all we have to fear, and arm ourselves against, this nameless suffering, which creates doubt in the love of God, removes us from our neighbours and prepares the ground for the idols of this age. Also to those who stand outside the present war the sight of the suffering of others is a mighty temptation to desert the God Whom Jesus called Father.

Has this unbelievable suffering separated us from the love of Christ? In the midst of it and often through it we meet our Saviour with His mercy which supports and raises us. The Patient One imparts to us His patience, the Faithful One His faithfulness, and the Merciful One His mercy. Only through Him we reach the world of kindness, only in Him we have power to resist the temptation of suffering. At this time it is especially important that Christians should be united in the strong convictions which the apostle has expressed in these words.

Christian students have been brought into solitude and isolation. Barriers have been raised between countries and peoples, hindering personal fellowship and mutual conversation, which should edify and strengthen the Christian life and be of use to the Kingdom of God. Hands that want to do the deeds of love are forced to bear weapons. The world is traversed by different frontiers. But there is one unseen frontier which we must hold, on the right side of which we must take our stand: the frontier of love against the assault of suffering. Here all those who have experienced the love of Christ are united. They have their fellowship in this love, although it cannot be expressed just now, except through prayer. Let us on this day of prayer ask our Heavenly Father for faith, steadfast in the trial of suffering; for love, growing out of our meeting with Christ, from Whom no earthly suffering has the power to part us; and for hope, pointing to us a future, where Christian students may once more be able to meet in a recovered world. And let us pray for our suffering brethren that their suffering may become a suffering in fellowship with our Saviour.

THE OFFICERS OF THE
WORLD'S STUDENT CHRISTIAN FEDERATION.

Studies in the Fourth Gospel

RICHARD ROBERTS

Second Series

SIN, SALVATION AND ETERNAL LIFE

I.

In a little book recently published, Dr. Charles Raven says that in Christian Doctrine we start not with *sin* but with *God*. The initiated well understand that this is a tilt at another theologian, no less well-known, whose preoccupation with sin has been a fertile field of discussion for some time past. Into this debate I will not enter here beyond remarking that apart from the postulate of a righteous God, theologically there cannot be any meaning in the word *sin*. It is however not without interest to observe that only one New Testament book begins with the Word God, namely the Epistle to the Hebrews. But the Fourth Gospel comes a close second: "In the beginning was the Word," the Logos; and the name of God comes in the next clause: "And the Word was with God." But the word *sin* the author of the Gospel appears to shun as much as he can. Its first appearance is in 1: 29—"Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world." It does not occur again until the eighth chapter; and in the form of the single noun, it only occurs six times in the whole Gospel. As a verb, it occurs even less. But this does not mean that there are no other allusions to the thing *Sin*. Here is an instance: "This is the condemnation, that light is come into the world, and men loved darkness rather than light, because their deeds were evil." (3: 19.) Here is essential sin,—the repudiation of the light that came by Jesus Christ.

But we are not to assume that an evil deed is *per se* sin. An evil deed done in ignorance is still an evil deed, and it is not to be accounted as sin. "If ye were blind," said Jesus to a company of Pharisees, "ye should have no sin." If they knew no better, they were rather to be pitied. But the Pharisees boasted of their light, even their monopoly of light; and therefore, as Jesus said, their sin remained. To persist in refusing to see the light is not only sin, it is the unpardonable sin, the sin of putting out one's own moral eyes (9: 41). At least twice more, Jesus stressed the point: "If I had not come and spoken to them they had not had sin; but now they

have no cloak for their sin." (15: 22.) "If I had not done among them the works that no other man had done, they had not had sin." (15: 24.) Neither His words nor His works moved them. To love darkness rather than light is the essence of sin; to persist in it in the face of the light is the capital sin, the sin that cannot be forgiven.

The words *judgment* and *condemnation* which occur frequently in this connection in the Fourth Gospel are both alike a translation of the same Greek word, *krisis*, which has domesticated itself in English speech as *crisis*. In our use of it, it signifies a grave emergency, in which serious decisions are called for. In the Greek, it was a word of considerable elasticity. According to Liddell and Scott's *Lexicon*, it may stand for a separating, a choice, a deciding, a judgment, a sentence, a trial, a quarrel. In its adjectival form in English usage, it has some of its original elasticity; it may be used to designate the intention of an editorial or a literary essay. It may also be used to describe a dangerous moment in the course of a fever. In the Fourth Gospel it refers indifferently to judgment and condemnation; and we have to infer its precise meaning, when it occurs in the text, from the context. Here is an instance of how James Moffatt overcomes the difficulty of distinguishing between the two uses of the word: "God did not send his Son into the world to pass sentence upon it, but to save the world by him. He who believes in him is not sentenced; he who will not believe is sentenced already, for having refused to believe in the name of the only Son of God. And this is the sentence of condemnation, that the Light has entered the world and yet men have preferred darkness to light." (3: 17, 18, 19a.)

However, it serves little purpose to discriminate between legal terms in this context. For the actual issue here is not an affair of legal justice or the vindication of law. It is rather the question of man's relation to God, and therefore to Jesus, the incarnate Son of God, and this is an affair of life and death, and not only of time, but also of eternity. The order of Law, by the very coming of Jesus, had been superseded by the order of Grace and Truth. The evangelist makes it clear that the Incarnate Word had not come into the world as a Judge but as a Saviour; and he who accepts Him goes free. He who rejects Him passes judgment upon himself by the very act. It is not necessary to bring to judgment the man who refuses to believe in the Only Begotten Son of the Father. By his refusal, he puts himself beyond the pale of Life.

II.

It was, however, to a law-ridden world that Jesus had come. In Palestine two great systems of law stood over against one another, the Law of Moses and the Law of Rome. The conquered people, and particularly, their leaders left no expedient idle that might serve

to secure the survival of the Mosaic code. But Jesus had no illusions about the limitations of Jewish law,—both the code and the glosses upon it which had multiplied through the years by the industry of the professional lawyers. One notable tract of his teaching is concerned with demonstrating the inherent but unrecognised implications of certain points of the Mosaic code. For instance,

“Ye have heard that it hath been said by them of old time, Thou shalt not forswear thyself, but shalt perform unto the Lord thine oaths: But I say unto you, Swear not at all; neither by heaven; for it is God’s throne; Nor by the earth; for it is his footstool: neither by Jerusalem; for it is the city of the great King. Neither shalt thou swear by thy head, because thou canst not make one hair white or black. But let your communication be, Yea, yea; Nay, nay: for whatsoever is more than these cometh of evil.” (Matt. 5: 33-37.)

That is to say, there cannot be a double standard (much less a multiple standard) of truth,—sworn truth and unsworn. For a double standard of truth undermines the purposes of speech, which is the main organ in creating and nourishing fellowship. A society in which truth is regarded lightly is inviting disintegration and destruction.

But in a society which was under a rule of religious legalism, it was not possible to avoid controversy especially when the letter of the law was sacrosanct; and those Hebrew fundamentalists, the Pharisees, gave Jesus no peace. So He had to deal with them in their own coin and speak to them in their idiom. If they wanted to argue in terms of the Law, and speak of judgment and condemnation, so be it. By virtue of His divine Sonship, He was also the Judge and all judgment was committed to Him (5: 22). Nor was it a delegated office; it was inherent in His Sonship. “The Father hath given to the Son to have life in himself” (5: 26), that is to say, the Son is autonomous; and by virtue of His autonomy, He has “authority to execute judgment” (5: 27). But this authority is inherent in Him also because He is the Son of man no less than He is the Son of God. He is, so to speak, the supremely representative Man, the embodiment of ideal manhood, yet a man among men. There seems to be a suggestion here that the Eternal Logos is too far from men to enable Him to judge the human sinner. But, as the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews says, the Incarnate Logos is touched with the feeling of our infirmities, having been tempted in all points as we are, yet without sin (Heb. 4: 15). Nor is it on this ground alone that the Son is competent to judge us. “My judgment is just, because I do not seek my own will.” (5: 30.) He is the only perfectly disinterested judge, for His will is gathered up into the will

of His Father, so that when He judges, it is not his own verdict that He renders. "As I hear, I judge," that is to say, I pronounce the verdict which My Father puts into My mouth (5: 30). It is difficult to reconcile this saying with a previous one: "The Father judgeth no man but hath committed all judgment to the Son" (5: 22); and this is by no means the only instance of contradictory statement in the Gospel.

But the author of the Gospel is actually attempting a task beyond the capacity of a man however inspired. He is trying to describe a life lived in two dimensions simultaneously. He accepts the truth of the incarnation and the implications of his own saying, "The Word became flesh", and sets out to write the biography of a person in two dimensions, *time* and *eternity*. From the nature of the case such a story must be full of paradoxes and apparent contradictions. Here we have the source of the main difficulties of this Gospel. What, for instance, is a simple reader to make of this passage in which there is only one word of more than two syllables: "Ye judge according to the flesh; I judge no man; and yet, if I judge, my judgment is true, for I am not alone; but I and the Father that sent me."? There are many passages of like difficulty in this Gospel. Of such passages, we should assume that they belong to a dimension of spiritual insight with which most of us are unacquainted; and we must be content to make of them, with the measure and quality of insight which have been given to us, what we can. This does not necessarily mean that this condition is permanent. On the contrary, it is possible for a man who has not sworn his soul away to rise, by the sedulous "practice of the presence of God", to a level of spiritual insight that may transfigure his world, and put him at ease in the company of the author of the Fourth Gospel and his like. This was the world of light and life which Jesus came to open to all believers. But few of us cross that threshold.

III.

Over against sin, there is salvation. This is announced at the beginning of the Gospel. The Baptist speaks of Jesus as having come to take away the sin of the world; and Jesus Himself at a later time declared that He had not come to judge the world but to save it (12: 47). But of anything comparable to what our forefathers called "the plan of salvation" there is hardly a trace. Some of the great words of the Synoptic Gospels in this context, for instance, *forgiveness* and *repentance* do not appear in the Fourth. Even the word *grace* does not appear after the Prologue; and nowhere is there a direct statement of the meaning of the words *save* and *salvation*. They are left to tell their own tale. We derive the words from the Latin. When a Roman was setting out on a

journey, his friends would say to him, *Salve!* which we in our idiom would render: "A good time to you!" The corresponding Greek word was similarly used as a general greeting at meeting or parting. But when these words were used among Christians, they signified other and deeper things,—in particular, spiritual security and well being, even in a world which hated and despised them. Already they knew themselves to be saved. Not indeed that they should have an easy time. On the contrary, Jesus warns them of difficult times:

"Behold the hour cometh, yea, is now come, that ye shall be scattered, every man to his own, and shall leave me alone. Yet I am not alone because the Father is with me. These things I have spoken unto you, that in me ye might have peace. In the world ye shall have tribulation; but be of good cheer. I have overcome the world." (16: 32-33.)

But that was not the end of the story. Of that, Jesus had spoken on an earlier occasion:

"Let not your heart be troubled; ye believe in God; believe also in me. In my Father's house there are many mansions. If it were not so, I would have told you. I go to prepare a place for you; and if I go and prepare a place for you, I will come again and receive you unto myself, that where I am, there ye may be also." (14: 1-2.)

The peak of salvation is *eternal life*. The word *everlasting* is occasionally used as an alternative to *eternal* in the Authorised Version. But whether there is a definite principle governing the alternation does not appear. The concept of eternity stands in antithesis to *time*, at least to measurable time. Time as we know it will disappear with the last man, when this world's day is done. But what the alternative to time is, or whether there be such an alternative, we cannot *know*. That there is something somewhere, where life persists is implied in the Christian doctrine of Immortality. Jesus certainly believed it to be so, for He gives it a name, "*my Father's house*". Moreover, that man may attain to life beyond death is at least a reasonable inference from the persistence of the habit of *prayer* which, however crude it be, may reasonably be regarded as the expression of an instinctive *élan* towards an existence beyond "this bourne of time and space". It has been said that "if the religious instincts of humanity do not point to a reality as their object, they are out of analogy with other instinctive endowments". For the present, as another John has put it, "It doth not yet appear what we shall be; but we know that when He appeareth, we shall be like him, for we shall see him as he is." (I John 3: 2.)

But while we may not know now what eternal life is, we may know something of the way into it. The writer of the Fourth Gospel has much to say about it; but we can here only notice the most significant points:

1. *Faith* (3: 16). This is probably the most widely known and loved passage in Holy Writ. Just here, however, we are concerned only with one word in it, namely "*believeth*". Here it figures as the way to eternal life. Faith is an act of the will, evoked by a conviction; it persists as an attitude of the whole person, an attitude frequently renewed by continual affirmations of the conviction. This conviction is that Jesus is the Christ, the Saviour of the world.

2. *Work* (4: 31-36). The Work is that of leading men to God through Jesus Christ, and of seizing every opportunity of doing so. "Lift up your eyes and look upon the fields, for they are white already to harvest. And he that reapeth, receiveth wages and gathereth fruit unto life eternal." The saving of souls is the vocation of all Christians—a vocation, however, honoured more by the breach than by the performance in contemporary Christendom.

3. *Fellowship* (6: 54). "Whoso eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood hath eternal life." This strong, even violent figure of speech is intended to indicate the intensity of the fellowship into which the Son of man calls His followers and looks for from them. They are called to live in such intimacy with Him, and He with them, that they, as it were, so absorb Him and become assimilated to him that they and He are virtually a single organism, with one mind and purpose. This relation to the living Christ is also a rarity in modern Christendom.

4. *Sustenance* (6: 33-35; 7: 37). Jesus declares Himself to be food and drink to them who follow Him. They shall neither hunger nor thirst. What food and drink do for the body, the living Christ does for the soul,—He keeps it in health and strength.

A LETTER FROM THE EDITOR TO HIS FRIENDS IN EUROPE

Two full years have passed since I crossed the Atlantic from Europe. They have not been stationary years, for I have visited students in eight countries and hundreds of colleges, from New York to Buenos Aires, from Santiago-de-Chile to San Francisco, from Vancouver to Halifax, from Winnipeg to Mexico City! No month has passed without letters and documents from Europe, to keep me in touch with you; and I am still introduced as "a visitor from Geneva"! I have made innumerable speeches about students in Europe, some of which might have caused you amusement or irritation; none, I hope, anger. But all the time I have felt I was an exile, not so much because I did not return to Europe, as because I could not. If absence makes the heart grow fonder, affection is certainly increased when absence is enforced. Now as I wait day by day for a passage to my own country—in a queer "debateable land" of the mind between two continents—I should like to share with you some reflections in a letter to reach you for the Day of Prayer for Students, the only action in our fellowship we may still call universal.

American students have a habit of referring to "war-torn Europe", as if it were an historical and geographical phenomenon remote from their experience; and in a sense it is so. You say yourselves in the message from the meeting at Présinge: "The complete upheaval of the whole tradition of continental Europe, the heritage of a civilisation interpenetrated by Christianity, faces us with a problem very different from that which faces English-speaking countries." It is impossible for us to imagine what your European experience is like, with the very ground of your tradition heaving beneath your feet. Yet the problem which faces North American students, though different, is intimately related to yours. They know now that an eruption in Europe, or the Far East, is a symptom of a general thinness of the crust of civilisation. They never believed that this was so, and now they are being transported all over the world to prevent further eruptions, like men putting out fire with their hands. It is very difficult to be involved in a great crisis of mankind of which you have no first-hand knowledge, to fight a war because it must be fought rather than because of what has happened to your country.

The difference between the problems we face is clearly brought out in the questions we ask. You remember the questions raised at the Poughkeepsie meeting earlier this year? It is interesting to look at them in relation to the questions in the message from Présinge. Yours on the whole are moral questions, asked from the inside, ours on the whole are political questions, asked from the outside; your questions have their main bearing on the present, ours on the future. Yet these two sets of questions are not in opposition, they are complementary. The questions from the outside are meaningless unless those from the inside are being asked; some of the questions from the inside can find no answers unless those from the outside are answered first. The emphasis of English-speaking students on social and political problems, and plans for their solution, does not mean an absence of moral interest; rather it springs from the conviction that some of the supreme moral problems of the day are on the political level. But your dealing in plain terms, like lies and anarchy, suffering and hate, is a most salutary corrective. American students are apt to go off into a queer incantation of great, sweeping phrases, and the progress of evil is never in any way arrested by such means. Yet perhaps the desire on this side of the Atlantic to discuss the rebuilding of order in the world will remind you that it is as well to have some pattern to which we are working as Christians, if we are to face our immediate problems with courage and initiative.

The most wonderful thing to my mind is that in our thought and conversation we are so conscious of one another. The messages from Poughkeepsie and Présinge both begin with expressions of community in spite of distances, and barriers of war. We realise at once that it is not our experience of war and disaster which unites us, but our experience of Christ. As we face our problems, different as they may be, we are together learning more of Him. The profound change in the statements of their faith made by groups of American students in recent years is not simply a change in words, nor a by-product of a war situation; it betokens a fuller understanding of Jesus Christ. As I have visited the new student Christian movements in Latin American countries I have been struck with the desire to study the New Testament, not only because it would help their members in their daily life, but because it would strengthen their eventual contribution as movements to the whole Federation. Further, all that has happened to Christians in Europe, and in the Far East, has never primarily attracted sympathy; it has always constituted first and foremost a witness to their Lord. You have no conception how deeply the life of the movements in Canada and the States has been affected in this way.

I do not suggest that this new experience of Christ is a matter of personal piety alone. It is of course strictly relevant to the kind of study which THE STUDENT WORLD has been seeking to encourage. We have to think ahead very practically for the future, but we have to do so as Christians. As never before we have an opportunity of doing this, of turning Christian faith into intelligent moral action, just because our principal medium of common understanding is not political or social, but religious. Christians not only have a peculiar obligation in times like these to think realistically about the future, they also have a flying start. We can talk with one another, while the secular world has no language it can use. Our interchange of questions between North America and Europe may not seem very epoch-making, but there is not much taking place that rivals it. Perhaps the very fact that we do not try to make up our minds alone as national groups, or as united nations' groups, is the first step towards a Christian view of the world.

Our Swedish friends, to whom we owe the Call to Prayer this year, have most movingly drawn attention, as one of the Présinge questions has done, to the fact of human suffering. My task on this continent has been to try to interpret suffering, such as I have not experienced, to others who can scarcely imagine it. The temptation for Christians outside Europe and outside the Far Eastern conflict, is to lay emphasis on all the nobler aspects and results of suffering, and so to avoid its full impact. This challenge from inside is therefore good for us. Yet the more terrible suffering is, the more Christians must seek to save others from its most lasting effects. I should like to say that the effort on the part of student leaders on this continent to raise money for the relief of suffering amongst students in China and in Europe, indeed wherever they can be reached, is based on a genuine desire to associate themselves with suffering. Much giving of money is of course superficial but, as I have gone from campus to campus speaking for "the fund", I have again and again been made aware that the reality which could compel men was not any fund, but the Federation behind it. Indeed the fault of the North American student is that he is apt to think you are the Federation, while he is somehow on the outside. His misfortune is that he belongs to a nation that has never been conscious of needing any help. The American Christian student is becoming aware of his loneliness, and his helplessness. As he too enters in increasing measure into that area of suffering, where you have been before him, he will feel more than ever part of the Federation.

And in the years ahead you will need him as badly as he will need you. He has lost his confidence in some of his ideals for the world, but not his confidence in the future. As he goes to war, he goes that he may meet you some day. The World Christian Youth Con-

ference in Amsterdam in 1939 marked for him, as for you, a long step forward in relationships. When you meet again some day you will be nearer and not farther apart. War divides men most evilly, but in so far as it sends Christians back to their deepest loyalty to Jesus Christ, it makes them more aware of one another as members of His family.

And so, if for two years I have been an exile, I have also been at home. The Federation may have a headquarters in Geneva, and its general secretary may have temporary addresses in New York and Toronto, but none of these indications can locate it. The Federation lives in the minds and hearts of men and women in an astonishing variety of places and circumstances. As you and I remember it in our prayers, we know assuredly that it rests also in the mind and heart of God, and that is the only guarantee we need for deeper understanding, for future meeting, and for constructive work ahead.

R. C. M.

THE STUDENT WORLD CHRONICLE

An Australian View of the Religion of the Soldier

The Army is a unique laboratory for research into social and religious questions. The "uniforming" of almost a complete cross-section of society and their segregation into a single controlled group makes possible a close examination of the beliefs and thoughts of an entire generation of men, and to a lesser extent of women. If the leaders of the Christian Church wish to discover what, apart from convention, are the faiths and standards men really live by, what are the strengths and weaknesses of men in their "natural" state, what is their thought on God, life, death and immortality, then here is the chance to make that discovery. Here, too, we can learn of their criticism of the social order and of the Church, their conceptions of the Christian religion, their thoughts about Jesus Christ, the type of social and religious movement that wins their sympathy and support.

Such an enquiry demands both the attention and participation of the Student Christian Movement, both as a service to the Church and as a direct and essential part of its own work. . . . What, then, are the soldier's beliefs and thoughts on religious and ethical questions? (A different question, of course, from the absorbing, if ticklish, one of the official Army attitude to religion.)

Life and Doctrine

The men meet "religion" principally (and often almost exclusively) in the person of the Padre (for they rarely associate the work of the Red Cross or the Y.M.C.A. with religion) and on the church parade. In most large units church parades are compulsory, though frequently there is some slight reluctance on the part of C.O.'s to insist on their being held. The attitude of the great bulk of the men to church parade is determined by the respect or otherwise they have for the Padre conducting it. A pious, artificial or "phoney" chaplain will be drowned out with coughing or talking *sotto voce*; a man who has a plain message and who is himself "doing a job" will get as eager an audience as any man could desire—though an audience sometimes a little mystified by

the "unreality" of ecclesiastical formulas and practices. For, broadly speaking, the men have little or no understanding of the doctrinal side of Christianity—such phrases as "the Kingdom of God", "the presence of the Holy Spirit", "the Church Universal", are entirely without meaning; yet they have a real understanding of the inner ethic of active goodwill, limited though this goodwill be to their own class and race. The average Australian soldier has a vague, elementary belief in God; he has some sort of religion, though it falls short of being Christian at many points. The one time when it may come to the surface in more or less articulate expression is when a man is face to face with death and an almost instinctive prayer for safety breaks from his lips. It is unwise to place too great significance on this well-attested phenomenon, but it does suggest that in the presence of the most terrific display of material force that human history has ever seen, men believe that there is an Unseen Power, inaccessible to the senses, which is yet mightier than high explosives and in whose hands are all the issues of life and death.

But withal this religion is desperately in need of educating and Christianising. "The religion of 90% of the men in the Army is not distinctly Christian, but a religion of patriotism and valour, tinged with chivalry, and at the best merely coloured with sentiment and emotion borrowed from Christianity." In the unit with which I am most familiar, about 10% go to church (as distinct from church parade) voluntarily and with regularity, while for about 5% their Christian faith is a conscious, empowering, vitalising experience to them, producing a quality of life respected and appreciated by officers and men alike. To the vast majority, then, God is an ill-defined and distant Omnipotence, almost totally unrelated to every-day life.

The subject of a future life is, strangely, rarely discussed, though one has the impression that it is pressing on the subconscious continuously. For men face to face with the possibility of death by mutilation or incineration in a tank, or in equally unpleasant ways, some sort of terms have to be made with death if the future is not to be too unnerving. The usual compromise takes the form of a fatalism, deriving not from any intellectual conviction but from practical necessity. This fatalism is always tinged with the hope that "it mightn't be me" and that "perhaps it won't be the end after all". There is practically no belief in the Christian doctrine of resurrection (mainly, one feels, for lack of adequate exposition), and no thought that death may mean the beginning of future service with fuller scope and better instruments of expression (probably because few men consider the purpose of this life to be the service of others). There is often expressed, though I

doubt if it is seriously believed, the vague suggestion that death in battle for one's country will ensure an immortality in a (presumably) nationalistic Valhalla.

On all these great questions of life and death there is a crying need for constant, simple, convinced Christian teaching, to which a profound and ready response will be found.

Christ and His Church

A subject of the highest importance in this enquiry is the attitude of the men to the person of Jesus Christ. There is a curious duality of attitude to Him. The constant blasphemous use of His name implies an unconscious recognition of His central significance. Men use His name to give weight to their words because it has some mystic potency. But the Jesus Christ spoken of by the Chaplain is a figure for whom they have the deepest respect, occasionally quoting (or misquoting) His words as an authoritative and final answer in discussion. Their conception is too often coloured by the sentimental and unheroic picture of Him acquired in their childhood or conveyed by poor religious literature. There is a vague feeling of uneasiness about His miracles, a very real and deep understanding of the Cross as self-sacrifice for others, though little understanding of it as revealing the nature of God or giving a clue to history. The Living Christ, working through the Holy Spirit, is practically unknown, and the connection of Christ and God remains an unsolved mystery. There is certainly no hostility to Jesus as an historic figure, though equally there is no general appropriation of His life-giving power. Christ the Master of men, of life and of death—this we must preach and live, for the true gospel most certainly has not lost its vitality.

With this lack of understanding of Jesus one can but expect little appreciation of the nature and reality of the Church. . . . It has lost its intellectual hold on men, largely because it fails to deal with realities; Church services often seem unnatural, denominational strife undignified, preaching disfigured by cant and compromise. Much of this criticism, it must be admitted, is based on ignorance and is an excuse rather than a reason for lack of interest. To a number of men, the churches in the towns where they may have been stationed have been a real home, the one institution (apart from the pubs.) where they have found a welcome, and one of the few real sources of inspiration in their lives. In short, men demand simplicity and honesty in religion. They readily distinguish between real and conventional Christianity, generally taking it at its conventional valuation, but readily embracing it when it strikes a note of reality and when it displays active goodwill.

What are we fighting for?

It has come as rather a shock to me personally to discover how very little thinking has been done on the real issues of the war and how deep the reluctance to do it. The only generally held motivation for fighting is to save this country from the "bloody little Japs". Not a single officer or other-ranker with whom I have discussed the matter has considered we are fighting for any "principles"—least of all democratic principles. These latter are suspect by officers as prejudicial to discipline and used by the men too often as excuses for irresponsibility. There is here a deep and urgent need for education along the lines of our too little understood "legal consciousness", if we are to avoid a rift between the civil exponents of war aims and the actual convictions of the fighting forces. The place of Christianity as the foundation stone of democracy needs constant reiteration and exposition, for where are we if men actually doing the fighting not only fail to appreciate, but deliberately repudiate the things we fondly declare are the objectives of their sacrificial effort?

War and Morality

What has been the impact of the war on morality? There is, of course, a complete shift of moral standards when men pass from civilian to military life. Concepts of right and wrong in the realm of property, sex, language, discipline, are radically modified. The basic consideration in the Army—efficiency in performing military duty—becomes the sole criterion of conduct. This imposes several restraints on men's freedom and the pressure of this discipline forces men to seek outlets in ways not frowned on by the Army—sex and language notably. The general "hardening process" is both soul-destroying and soul-creating. Military life undoubtedly kills a great deal of mental and spiritual initiative. It is a sad paradox that the men who are prepared to give the best years of their life and possibly life itself for a cause, rarely exert the mental effort to read a substantial article or book on the issues for which they are jeopardizing their lives. "Pix" is the main literary food in camps, though well-presented talks on serious subjects do get a substantial response. There is both a light and a dark side to this question of the moral impact of military life. On the one hand we have a craving for self-indulgent activities when home restraints are loosened, offset by a development of self-respect in dress and carriage, a greater variety in life through travel. An intensified nationalism is compensated for by the education travel brings. The process of learning to kill men goes on side by side with the development of a magnificent sense of comradeship. A cheerful-

ness under hardship, a devotion to duty, an unselfishness, a courage, a sincerity and a humility are strangely intermixed with a crudeness, a profanity, and an immorality which, after all, is typical of the strange creature "man" seen in his moral nakedness.

Finally, it is worthy of note that the men are very responsive to the suggestion that there are things they can *live* for as well as die for, that there is a task ahead of them in peace as in war. Planning a better Australia they see to be their task if and when they get through the present all-absorbing business. The appeal of the comprehensive ideal we have come to see in the W.S.C.F. is strong here. The story of Christian missionary activity, told as the record of a great crusade for the betterment of backward peoples through education, medicine, and faith, is a story to which they thrill because they have something of the ardour of crusaders (however much it may be knocked out of them by the monotony or harshness of war). We can and must put the Federation concept continually before men, for it comes to many as a real light through the thick darkness of the future. Some are suspect of it—it savours too much of a betrayal of their basic loyalty, patriotism—but once let them understand that it is the fine flower of true patriotism and no denial of it, then the idea grips.

This analysis of the religion of the fighting man may appear to be a gloomy picture. But there are two things that should be said by way of balancing the judgment: first, that we can hardly expect the average Australian youth to be religious when the trend of our educational and social life lacks Christian content—it is not the soldier's fault as such, he is a symptom not a cause; and secondly—and this is important—whatever his outward faith, the Australian soldier, trained, experienced, and disciplined (not the raw and callow youth caught off his balance), is in every way a *man*, for whom I personally am developing the greatest respect and, as time goes on, a deep affection. At his best (and he is often there) he is a quiet, solid, dependable, hard-working, self-respecting, soft-spoken, reverent man. The ill-disciplined, rowdy youngsters are the raw material—for them much must be done, and there is our job. Give him a knowledge of the issues at stake, give him a faith that will bring poise and self-respect, give him a vision of a world community to work for, give him healthy recreation, interesting educational material, clean society and, above all, the incessant inspiration of a fellowship with the Master of men, and out of the maelstrom of war will emerge one who speaks and acts with authority and nobility. But how much we have to do in this process and how weak our efforts to date!

J. C. ALEXANDER.

BOOK REVIEWS

TWENTY-ONE YEARS A-BUILDING. By E. A. Dale. Student Christian Movement of Canada.

Recueillir pour mieux sauter is the spirit behind this short account of the Student Christian Movement of Canada. Only a brief period has elapsed since the beginning of the organisation, but through the pages are glimpses of how deeply the work and the fellowship have become rooted in the universities of Canada. Ahead of the Movement lies a long future, because the foundations have been so solidly built. Students have made these foundations; they have created and owned the structure which now lives as a testimonial to their workmanship. Between the lines are unrecorded stories of small committees working hard and long, student leadership, difficult decisions, sacrifice. From the speech of the student who had been in prison in Germany in the 1914-1918 war at the first conference to the lines of *Poisoning the Student Mind*—printed in full at the close of the leaflet—everything seems indigenous to student soil. Effective use has been made of articles by students published in the *Canadian Student*, and through their opinions, blunt and honest, the course of growth is traced.

Especially interesting is the nice degree of balance between theory and practice, belief and action. On the one hand there is the importance of the "Records" study groups, central in all the twenty-one years; on the other hand variety of action, from the student delegation sent to Ottawa about Disarmament to the holding of the conference on national issues in recent years. Another characteristic is the constant awareness of membership in the "Larger Fellowship", especially in the World's Student Christian Federation. The Movement was affiliated with the Federation from the beginning, and steps have constantly been taken to make it world-minded. A prominent place has always been given to the participation of students from other countries in the conferences.

Writing this review from across the boundary between Canada and the States, it must be said how much there is to covet for the United States Student Christian Movement in the spirit and experience of the Canadian Movement. Apart from such full participation of Canadian students as took place at the Des Moines conference of the Student Volunteer Movement in 1919, there is little to show for

the impact of the two movements on each other. Because of the sheer cumbersome weight of numbers the United States Movement lacks the student initiative and cohesiveness felt so sharply in the pages of the report. There is a greater closeness between the Canadian and British Movements, which has important implications for the Federation, as seen in the rôle of the Canadian delegation in the American-British-Canadian Reading Party held some years ago.

Where one generation of students passes along so quickly, and another is always coming on, it is easy to lose all sense of the whole in the parts. For this reason it is good to have such histories written down for other movements to read and ponder. The facts of student initiative, the religious centre from which the practical work has grown, and world-mindedness are important, but even more so is the feeling with which one closes the booklet, and reads the Prayer on the back cover, that here is a Student Christian Movement for which all the doors are open to carry forward its life and work into full maturity.

H. M.

THE CHRISTIAN BASIS OF A NEW SOCIETY. By Rose Terlin. Published by the World's Y.W.C.A. and obtainable at Headquarters of the National Associations.

Rose Terlin in her new study outline, entitled *The Christian Basis of a New Society*, has done a very sound and useful job. Back of this pamphlet lie many months of work in which Miss Terlin sought to gather material from Christians in many countries. The most important ecumenical documents are quoted at some length. There is a section on "Some Basic Elements of the Christian Faith" in which a very balanced statement of the theological background is presented. There follow chapters on political organisation with emphasis upon the problems of democracy, on economic reconstruction and on world order. In each chapter the analysis of the issues and a brief statement of most important points of view are accompanied by several pages of questions. I admire greatly the insight and skill with which all of this is done. The studies of equality and of democracy, for example, show remarkable discrimination.

There is no doubt that this pamphlet is not written for beginners. It would require a good deal of theological understanding to appreciate it fully. On the other hand there is no reason why leaders of groups should not find it most illuminating for themselves in planning their work even if they must do a lot of diluting with milk in working with their groups. Also, why should people be so abnor-

mally afraid to think and to pay the price for a little technical understanding in the field of religion when they know that other fields are not easily mastered? I think that Miss Terlin is so very ecumenical that she is rather unfair to the American Church! She seldom refers to any American religious literature. She leaves the impression that the American Church has had little to say about economic justice (see pp. 47-48). It is true that the American Church has no William Temple or his equivalent, but there is a great amount of teaching in the American Church by its leaders in line with Miss Terlin's interest. Any one-sidedness here can most easily be corrected by those who use these studies with groups. I hope that this study outline—and it is more than that—will have very wide use in the Student Movements and that the Churches will find here an excellent basis for co-operative thinking among their leaders.

JOHN C. BENNETT.

CONDITIONS OF PEACE. By E. H. Carr. *The Macmillan Company, New York, 1942.*

E. H. Carr's new book, *Conditions of Peace*, is an excellent one, well written, stimulating and constructive, and Professor Carr has all of us in his debt because of the valuable contributions that he has made and is making to the study of international affairs.

Mr. Carr, however, like all the rest of us, is still confused and uncertain as to the wise and workable solution of the problems which confront us and the world we live in, for while he emphasises the revolutionary character of our society,—and in this I agree with him,—his proposals regarding co-operation between Britain and Germany, and a new order in Europe do but echo the best of the tolerant liberalism of the 1920s. Personally I am sympathetic toward these proposals but I wonder if they will do the job that must be done. The situation is revolutionary because the great driving force behind the present unrest and conflict is the determination of masses of people, proletarian and "colonial", to gain power, and the transfer of power from class to class, or attempts to achieve it are almost always revolutionary. This basic struggle is complicated, too, by other very real differences and divisions,—race, colour, culture and nationalism,—which are potent factors in our modern world. Professor Carr writes that "the old world is dead." I wish I were as sanguine as he seems to be that revolution or change in themselves provide a solution of the conditions they react against. One of the great problems of human existence is due to the fact that we desire the two incompatibles, stability and change, and, as a society, demand

both at the same time. The satisfactory adjustment of these two social and biological incompatible essentials is perhaps the most difficult of our human problems. One of the important functions of lawyers, politicians and statesmen, is to try to devise a framework of procedures and formulæ, with which these two opposing forces can operate, as they must, without destroying both the individuals and the organisations which they serve. That is why I do not expect too much from change, revolution or a new order in themselves alone. They do destroy much of the old, and they do change the shape of things, but they leave practically all of the basic problems of human life and relations still to be solved, even if the solutions they offer are new and different ones. In addition it is certain that revolutionaries, having once achieved their new order, will then become the guardians of stability and the *status quo*. Professor Carr also suggests that "Peace" is not or should not be a positive end in itself,—that it is a happy by-product of other circumstances. He also seems to argue that war, apart from certain 19th century wars, are beneficial or at least that it is "the most purposeful of our social institutions" and that in the absence of a satisfactory substitute it performs an essential social function. I doubt both of these views. Peace I envisage as a condition in which violence of a destructive kind is absent or controlled, and one of the major tasks of statesmanship is to shape conditions in which our problems can be solved and our needs satisfied without resort to violence. For violence is always destructive and wasteful even if at times it may be the only alternative to suffocation. But even if this be true the ideal is not to condone violence but to attempt to provide for the necessary changes by non-violent means.

Certainly it seems to be a historical fact, that peace, in the sense of the control of violence, is one of the first stages or goals of developing communities and societies and is very definitely an end in itself. As for war, I do admit that under its emotional stimulus we do many things that would otherwise be impossible; we serve, we sacrifice ourselves and our possessions, we co-operate, we provide employment and we become more inventive and creative. But I do not believe that the tempo of war is a normal or natural one for human beings, and its main aim is the waste and destruction of resources both human and material. One of the dangers in the war situation is that we remember the interesting, exciting and apparently beneficial things that accompany it, but its aftermath, the post-war period and problems, we blame on anything and everything except their true cause, the war itself. War is a group condition somewhat akin to individual intoxication. While it lasts we enjoy a sense of exhilaration; the morning after, we may feel very uncomfortable, but we

usually blame it on something we ate, rarely on the liquor we drank. One of the few good things that I hope may come out of this war is a more general conviction that war doesn't pay anybody anything but sorrow and hardship. As long as any considerable group of people believe it does or may pay dividends, emotional or material, we shall have war, for human beings will only be taught the hard way and even then they must seemingly be taught at frequent intervals. I had hoped and believed that we peoples of the democracies, Britain, France, America, Canada, Holland and the rest, were persuaded that war did not pay. One of my fears is that we may emerge from this total war as military peoples with a vested interest in militarism, and with a military economy rather than a welfare economy as our social objective. If we do, God help us all!

This brings me to the last point I want to comment upon, and that is the emphasis which Professor Carr and many more of our contemporaries place upon the moral issues involved. He states it in these words: "The essential nature of the crisis through which we are now living is neither military, nor political, nor economic, but moral. A new faith in a new moral purpose is required to reanimate our political and economic system." For those of us who are members of Student Christian Movements, the sections of this book dealing with the moral issues involved are perhaps the most important and the most interesting, for they will determine the foundations upon which we build. Nearly everything that Mr. Carr writes about the inadequacy of the 19th century social philosophy is true, and one is deeply moved by his plea for a new and dynamic moral purpose. But I am always a little suspicious of those engaged in the consideration of social, economic and political questions when they emphasise at length morals and moral issues, for too often it is an escape from the tremendously difficult problem of finding ordinary workable solutions, which are, I believe, the only sound and permanent solutions. I fully appreciate the tremendous importance of group belief and group conviction about a cause or a person or an ideal, and I know that much of the strength of the new movements as well as our own weakness lies just here. Hitler's strength is not military or economic alone. Much of it lies in the united purpose of young Germany. But its base and strength is essentially emotional, and our emotions, particularly our group emotions, are dangerous things to play with. Only the young can live on their emotions or on a high emotional plane for any length of time, and even in their case I do not believe it is either natural or healthy. But this is the least of its drawbacks. The real danger or evil is the ease with which mass emotions can be manipulated or perverted and the speed with which they can get out of hand. If morals, or a moral

purpose, means a belief in the desirability of a better way of life for everybody, a determination to achieve this, and a willingness patiently to work out ways and means of achieving it; if it means the practical application of Christian principles to our individual and collective lives, then I am strongly in favour of it. But if it means mass movements of an emotional character I doubt its permanent value. It will have great power, it may achieve tremendous changes, but my own belief is that most worth while things are achieved by slow, patient, intelligent effort.

For, as I said earlier, our human needs and problems are continuing ones that can only be satisfied and solved in a piece-meal and day to day fashion. No plan, no system and no revolution can settle them completely and permanently. In the beginning of this review I suggested that I did not believe that the "liberal" solutions put forward by Professor Carr for the future of the Anglo-German relations were adequate. I say this although I like them myself and believe that they are the only desirable and satisfactory solutions in any long term sense. But they assume good will and a willingness to co-operate on the part of both parties or all parties concerned. The tragedy of the present situation is that these methods are not only discredited but are denied validity by large sections of humanity, who ridicule them and consider them evidence of softness and weakness. I would, regretfully, suggest that much firmer and tougher policies must be pursued if we are to meet the ruthlessness of the Nazis and the Japanese militarists with any expectation of holding them in check. That is why I put peace, or the control of violence and of unregulated force, so high in my category of essentials. Without such control we shall again become the victims of the gangster-like mentality—with it, and, in addition, with the qualities and procedures that Professor Carr advances, there are possibilities that the world of the future will be a somewhat better world than the one we have known.

NORMAN MACKENZIE.

Notes on Contributors and Articles

JEAN BOSC is a former General Secretary of the French S.C.M. The article which appeared in *Correspondance Fédérative* has been translated by Dorothy Mackie.

ARNOLD NASH has been a secretary of the British S.C.M. and is now Chaplain to the S.C.M. in Toronto. His book entitled *The University and the Crisis in Liberal Democracy* will shortly be published.

CLARENCE P. SHEDD is a professor at Yale Divinity School, and the author of *Two Centuries of Student Christian Movements* and *The Church Follows its Students*. We are indebted to *The Intercollegian* for this article.

CHANG KUO-HSING is one of the members of the National Southwest Associated University who co-operated with the Kunming Student Relief Committee in giving first hand accounts of China's evacuated universities.

More Questions for Thinking Ahead was translated from the French by Margaret Patrick.

RICHARD ROBERTS is a Christian preacher and writer widely known in Great Britain, and North America. He has recently given greatly appreciated leadership to the New England S.C.M. on devotional and biblical lines.

J. C. ALEXANDER is a secretary of the Australian S.C.M. on leave for work with the Y.M.C.A. among the troops. His article is taken from *The Australian Intercollegian*.

The *Book Reviews* are by PRESIDENT N. A. M. MACKENZIE of the University of New Brunswick, PROFESSOR JOHN BENNETT of the Pacific School of Religion, and HELEN MORTON, Vice-Chairman of the W.S.C.F.